DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 595 CE 010 657

TITLE	Proceedings. NACVE-SACVE Joint Meeting. (Washington, D. C. May 5-7, 1976.)
INSTITUTION	National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	NACVE-013-77
PUB DATE	May 76
NOTE	245p.; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$12.71 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Advisory Committees; *Agency Role; Conference Reports; Conferences; *Federal Legislation; National Organizations; Speeches; State Agencies; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

Proceedings are presented for a 3-day State and national vocational education advisory council staff session which included (1) a congressional briefing by House and Senate members and staff on the current status of vocational education legislation; (2) discussions by different agency representatives on how they interpret the role of State advisory councils; and (3) small group sessions to consider "how-to" experiences. The contents are presented under the following headings: (1) Meeting of NACVE/SACVE Chairpersons and Executive Directors, (2) Keynote Address: Dr. Terrell Bell, (3) Panel: View of SACVE from Other Agencies, (4) Report from the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, (5) Congressional Briefing on Vocational Education, (6) Vocational Education: Featuring the Public Information Project, and (7) NACVE-SACVE Joint Fall Bicentennial Meeting. Appendixes contain the joint meeting schedule, analysis of pending Federal vocational education legislation, discussion group session summaries, and participant list. (HD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED137595

NACVE - SACVE JOINT MEETING
Hyatt Regency
Washington, D.C.
May 5-7, 1976

PROCEEDINGS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL 1776-1976

CE 010 657

NACVE-013-77

PREFACE

In an effort to bring together many new faces, new ideas and new expectations from across the nation, the NACVE/SACVE Joint Ad Hoc Planning Committee prepared the program for May 5-7, 1976 in Washington, D.C. Every effort was made to provide opportunities to learn through the sharing of recent information and experiences with those who attended previous meetings.

Highlights of the three-day event attended by state and national Advisory Council staff and presenters included (1) a comprehensive congressional briefing by House and Senate members and staff on the current status of vocational education legislation; (2) an opportunity to hear three significant agencies discuss how they interpret the role of state advisory councils; and (3) participation in small groups--an organized approach to consider solid "how-to" experiences.

Special appreciation is due Mr. Fred Hoke, Executive Director, West Virginia State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, for his leadership in planning the NACVE/SACVE Joint Ad Hoc Meeting. The Joint Ad Hoc Planning Committee is commended for developing a stimulating and provocative program. The national Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University is to be acknowledged for the development and publishing of these proceedings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

May 5, 1976

Meeting of NACVE/SACVE Chairpersons and Executive Directors 1

May 6, 1976

Keynote Address: Dr. Terrell Bell. 21

Panel: View of SACVE from Other Agencies 43

Report from the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. 79

Congressional Briefing on Vocational Education. 97

May 7, 1976

Vocational Education: Featuring the Public Information Project 165

NACVE-SACVE Joint Fall Bicentennial Meeting Planning. 185

APPENDICES. 201

Joint Meeting Schedule 203

Analysis of Pending Federal Vocational Education Legislation. 205

Discussion Group Session Summaries 217

Participant List 229

Evening Session
May 5, 1976

MEETING OF NACVE/SACVE

CHAIRPERSONS AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS

Called to Order by Fred A. Hoke,
Executive Director, West Virginia

Several months ago a questionnaire was sent to all state chairpeople by the chairman of the Massachusetts Advisory Council, Dr. John Dinkelspiel. Seventy-three percent were sent back to him with some issues that he thought would be interesting to discuss at this particular meeting.

At this point, I shall turn this portion of the meeting over to Gene Martin who will list for you the four major issues to be discussed.

Gene Martin

Good evening and welcome to Washington on behalf of Dr. J. O. Perpener, who is the Chairman of the D. C. Advisory Council, and on behalf of the D. C. Advisory Council. I will fill in until Dr. Perpener can arrive. There are four topics that you wanted to discuss in this evening's meeting, as tabulated by the chairperson of the Massachusetts Advisory Council.

The first topic was state issues, perhaps those of national significance that you expect to be facing in the period of 1977 to 1980. Some of the topics that emerged in the questionnaires were issues on the governance of vocational education, the public

image of vocational education, the acceptance of council recommendation by boards of education in the states, federal funds used for state administration versus the use of those funds for delivery of services, the problems of articulation between the vocational education and manpower programs, and the problems of linkages with other aspects of the vocational education and manpower training systems.

The second topic deals with the issues of advantages and disadvantages of a totally separate board of vocational education and the implications of that for the sole state agency approach.

The third topic listed by the chairpeople responding was the question of who acts as the council's fiscal agent.

And the fourth was whether or not there is a need for regular and more formal communication's mechanisms among the state advisory councils on policy and advisory matters beyond the two annual meetings that are held.

Dealing with the first topic and specifically with questions of linkages with CETA, a few minutes ago, I heard somebody point out that one of the prominent labor officials at the recent series of meetings in Jackson was heard to comment that they were very pleased with the fact that only ten percent of the total of CETA funds is being used in the administrationof programs, and that ninety percent is going out to the states and to local areas for the purposes which it is intended. And, it was pointed out that ten percent of $7 billion is $700 million, and that makes the money available for the administration of those CETA programs

slightly in excess of the amounts available for vocational education.

Is there any feeling about that? Any response or any concern on that?

Comment -- Michael Morton, Executive Director, Maryland

Senator Beall from Maryland is going to be introducing an amendment on the Senate floor to do away with planning commissions. As you probably know, planning commissions are optional and the Beall Bill is an amendment to eliminate the planning commission and states that have advisory councils would be charged with the responsibility of prior development of state plans recommending to the state board what priorities they feel should be addressed in the state plan and also the levels of funding. Some of you have misconstrued that the meaning of these four planning commissions is just the opposite. It is to eliminate completely the planning commissions and gives the same responsibilities that we already have now. We, in Maryland prefer the House bill version to the Senate bill and feel that the best thing that can happen is to get the Senate bill as close to the House bill as possible, so when it goes to conference committees there will be less room for negotiation. If you support that position, we would appreciate it if you would contact your United States Senator and pass that on to him. Are there any questions regarding that amendment some of you might have?

Comment

We have no quarrel with the ideas of doing away with the state planning council. Our council has talked about this and we seriously question the part that says that the state advisory council should become the planning agency or the planning commission. We have no quarrel with doing away with another administrative layer of a planning commission, in fact, we favor what Maryland was speaking about. But our council feels quite strongly that we would be involved then in the administration of vocational education if we set up the state plan and have that plan worked out and then it goes to the commissioner, as I understand it, and the state board then responds to that plan. I think that is definitely administration, and that is not what we are there for. And, I think we would lose part of our credibility and part of our reliability that people in the state have for us.

Comment

Under the Beall amendment the state advisory council would not be involved in the planning nor be responsible for the planning, only in recommending to the state board prior to their development what the council feels priority should be. It would not be doing anything that we probably should be already doing, which is recommending the priorities. On the House side they wouldn't even put that in legislation but on the Senate side they are or hope to and it is to satisfy the higher education

community, that is the NEA's admission. It is a compromise type position which is really spelling out some of the things that the House says we should be doing also. The Bill looks like it may fly, because in the Senate conference committee the Beall amendments only came out of committee on a 8 to 7 vote and two of the United States Senators who would have voted against it weren't present, they came in about fifteen minutes later, or it probably would have been defeated. But on the Senate floor, it is a different story so we need your support if you believe that way. We will be much better off if we can get the Senate bill closer to the House bill when it comes to conference time.

Comment

The two state issues that I (Paul Tschetter) think are most important to us in Colorado are public image and articulation. In the state of Colorado we have just concluded a study of what happened to the twenty-nine recommendations that we made in council from 1970 to 1975. It is extremely interesting to note that the image we have in Colorado on behalf of the Council on Vocational Education is a very blurred picture. As you start with the top vocational education people in the state department, it is relatively clear that from there on down to the public as well as to the local school district is becomes extremely muddled. I personally have felt this way for some time, that if vocational education as a concept is going to survive in our state we are going to have to seriously look and think about the image of vocational education and our study proves that.

Associated with this of course, is the fact of articulation and I think that somehow or other, state advisory councils are going to have to become a great deal more articulate because the two work together. May I now address another question?

For several meetings of the national and state council we have raised the question of the necessity of two national meetings. I believe that we have changed our thinking. It would not be possible this year because of the Bicentennial in Minneapolis, but I think we ought to give serious consideration to eliminating one. I know in the Western states we are thinking in terms of a single meeting and whether this will come about or not depends upon whether our schedule is carried out. If it is, it could easily result in one regional meeting, and I think one regional meeting and one national meeting -- prefereably in Washirgton, would be a desired situation. I have said this before and I take the soapbox again in favor of this kind of a concept.

Morton: Topic two deals with the advantages and disadvantages of totally separate boards of vocational education presumably separate from state boards of education. Does anyone want to continue with topic one or pick up topic two or continue the discussion of topic four?

Comment

You might spell out exactly what the Beall Amendment will be because I totally misunderstood it.

A question for Mike Morton from Maryland to go into more detail on the bill in the provisions in the Beall amendments.

Morton: I have a copy of the amendment which says that state advisory councils will eliminate first of all, the planning commission. It says that members of the higher education community will be required on the state advisory council to represent their position. State advisory councils will be charged with the responsibility of, prior to the development of the state plans, recommending to the state board of vocational education the areas of the priorities they feel the state board should consider for the next year's State Plan. They should also recommend the levels of funding, secondary vs. post-secondary, etc., and detail how that should be divided in the upcoming plan. That basically is Senator Beall's amendment. What we did was to get the council on higher education, community college board, the state board of education, the state directors, vocational association, the state chamber of commerce, the state teachers association, CETA, and several others to agree on that position before we went to Senator Beall so when we went to him we went as one voice. That puts him in a very strong position because he is not getting conflicting stories from various people in the state. Senator Beall's bill has the amendment attached to it which makes planning commissions optional. If everyone agrees on the state plan you don't have to have a planning commission. Our concern is that down the road somewhere one of these five or six groups that must be involved in the planning is going to disagree and you're going to be forced to establish a planning commission. In fact, the planning commission might even work

to cause conflict between groups to justify their existence in our minds. Our other feeling is that there are several states which are having problems between vocational education and higher education. Our feeling is that if they are having problems, they should solve them within the state, and not come to the federal level.

Comment

I am from Ohio. It could be that I don't understand the Beall amendments. I share Bill Nagel's reaction to the commission. If the advisory council becomes his responsibility for setting priorities in the state plan and also has responsibility toward levels of funding, it seems we are going to be getting into administration instead of responsibility as an advisory council. It appears to me that this is really not our responsibility; it could be that I don't understand the full impact of these amendments. But I believe that if we get over into recommending priorities or priorities of funding, that we would be getting out a large area of responsibility.

Comment

I'm Rufus Beamer from Virginia and I agree that the advisory councils do not want to get into the position of being in administration. That is why I agree. However, as I understand Mike and the amendment, this is to advise on priorities. It seems to me that the councils do that now. We advise on priorities. That's what we are all about. If it gets into

administration or making recommendations so strongly that they become administrative concerns then I would be thoroughly opposed to it. But if it's advising on priorities as I interpreted what Mike has said then it seems to me that we are in the clear and that we don't have another layer of administration.

Did you want to comment?

Comment -- Honorable Roman Pucinski

The discussion illustrates once again the debate that we've been having for eight years since we established the state advisory councils and the National Advisory Council in 1968. I'm inclined to agree with those who urge a cautious course on the Beall Amendment. If you recall the intent of Congress in 1968, we had a very difficult job. We wanted to have a broadly representative group of citizens in a state participating in the development of the state plan and so we provided in that legislation that the state advisory council shall play a key role in the entire development of a state plan and must be consulted along the entire route of the development. We felt so strongly about that, that we provided that the state advisory council has to certify that indeed the state advisory council has been consulted along the entire route of the development. Notice, we didn't want a state planning commission or a state superintendent or the chief school officer or whoever was doing it to develop a plan and then come to the state advisory council and say here it is, we want you to approve it. We wanted the input of this broadly represented group of citizens in the state from the beginning to the end of the

development of a plan but we were mindful, as members of Congress, that education is pretty much a state responsibility. And so we had to find some way to overcome the delicate balance between an advisory council that would play a key role in helping develop the plan and an advisory council that would superimpose federal standards on a state's program. And that's why we have this problem; it's a very, very difficult balance to reach.

We came up with the 1968 amendments, now the Beall Amendment, if I understand it correctly and I think I do, would drop the state planning commission and would place upon the state advisory council that responsibility. I respectfully submit that the average state advisory council in this country does not have the resources, does not have the funds, does not have the staff, does not have the capability of developing a state plan within its own resources. That's why we wanted you to be quarterbacks. It's much easier to be the quarterback, because somebody else has to do all the work and that's why I'm inclined to think that it might not be a wise idea to place all this responsibility on a state advisory council.

I personally, having sponsored the original 1968 amendments, would prefer to see the state advisory council as a revival, independent agency overseeing the entire operation, putting its input into that operation of being a member of the team that develops the state plan. But I am inclined to think that you would be shortchanging vocational education if you tried to take on that whole job yourself. I just don't think that within the state

advisory council level you'll have enough resources to take on this very exciting adventure that we are getting into. Particularly since vocational education is growing in leaps and bounds, as I travel around the country and see the number of people becoming more and more interested in vocational education.

As Marv Feldman pointed out recently at one of our meetings, thirteen and a half million young people are now enrolled in vocational education. We're spending $3 billion in this country on vocational education at all levels. I would suggest a very cautious course in trying to take on the whole job for two reasons: (1) because I don't think you have the resources, but (2) you would be doing the very thing that we tried to avoid. We do not want a federally constituted agency, which the state advisory councils are, to take over the management and the planning of local education. We would rather have the local administrators do that job and have the state advisory council sitting there in judgment as to whether it's a good job or a bad job, and then if you don't agree, if you are not fully participating in the development process, just don't sign--sign off on the state plan. So we gave you these extraordinary powers of refusing the signing of the state advisory plan if you feel you have not been sufficiently consulted in its development. I'm afraid that you might shortchange your state if you were to try to take on this job all by yourself. I just don't think that the state advisory councils have the resources to do that job within their own capability. So I would suggest that we proceed cautiously on the Beall Amendment.

Comment -- Michael Morton, Executive Director, Maryland

I agree with you Congressman that we don't want to take on the planning commission's planning function. But I disagree with you that you understand the bill that we would be doing the planning. As one of the people that wrote it, I know that it does not give up any responsibility for doing the planning. And as it comes before the Senate floor, the State Board of Vocational Education, as it is now constituted, that it would be in a future bill. It would not change the planning function of the State Board of Vocational Education at all. All it would do is say that state advisory councils would report, or give recommendations, to them what their best judgment is as the priorities before they develop the plans. I say this: we could do this now. There is nothing in the Beall Amendment that we do not have the authority or responsibility to do now.

Comment -- Pucinski

Your duties now are mandated. We said and OE has said they will not fund a state plan unless the state chairman, the state advisory council has signed off. As you know, this is an example of quirk. OE said go back and get their confiderce. So you have that now. But I say to you that in 1968 we had to draw a very delicate balance between federal control and supervision of state advisory councils. And I hope that the Beall Amendment would not upset that type of balance.

Comment -- Michael Moon, Executive Director, Louisiana

I know you want to get on with the program but I would just like to make this comment. I'm from the Bayou State of Louisiana and I would like to say that I concur full heartedly, 100 percent with what Congressman Pucinski is saying; however, I do not speak for my council in Louisiana. I would like to say what he has said is so true here that that delicate balance was drawn in the 1968 amendments and if you read those amendments carefully, you find three very important words: (1) advisory, (2) consulted, and (3) in conjunction with. As you look at those three words, that is really what our purpose is all about. And as the Congressman has pointed out, we make recommendations on these priorities of the state plan now. And if the Beall Amendment is passed all you are really doing is transferring one new layer of bureaucracy, and that's what it would be, from a planning commission to the state advisory council. Very briefly again let me concur with Congressman Pucinski that state advisory councils do not have the staff, do not have the funds, and really do not have the total planning expertise to perform such a function as this entails. And to tell you the truth, in Louisiana our state department of education and our state board of education is very capable of developing this plan. Really what needs to be done with the 1968 amendments is to be fully implemented. Because as they are written they are accurate with maybe some additional provisions. Let me say again that I concur fully what the Congressman has said here tonight.

Comment -- Mrs. Virginia Vieregg

I'm Mrs. Vieregg from Nebraska and I too would like to agree with Congressman Pucinski and disagree with Mike in that he asks us to take our problems and go home with them. If this is what we are supposed to do, we shouldn't be here at all. I think we are trying to share our mutual problems and come to some joint understanding. I would also like to speak of two other issues that were raised. The one question was asked about whether there was conflict between state advisory councils, and the state board of vocational education. And I think this again is what Congressman Pucinski was alluding to. As long as we remain advisory, we have found that we have a marvelous working relationship with our state board because they are very happy to have us serve as an arm and do some of the studying for them that they do not have time to do and make these recommendations. But as soon as we step beyond that and attempt to take over the administrative functions, we have alienated people and we think that while we are autonomous as we are, we are often able to move into areas and be very helpful in expressing what the state board would like to have said but we can do it without offending people.

Then I would also like to refer to the relationship with CETA and I think the need for some accommodations. I know we were a bit hesitant when we felt that it was necessary for us to be partners and I think our CETA member felt the same way and the labor people were looking at us like they weren't quite sure how this was going to work out and I think it was mainly because we are fighting so

hard over that 8 percent and the way it was being spent. In our state we're trying to prevent it being spent for allowances. But we found that as we had discussions that included the Commissioner of Education, members of the State Board, and members of the State Labor Department that it was far better to accommodate. We found that if we were not so rigid in holding out for this categorical amount, they were very willing to go beyond and could prove to us that they were spending more than that in other areas. So, we had jointly drafted a new resolution and come to an accommodation there in something that seemed to be quite a problem a year ago.

Comment -- Gene Martin

While Wally is coming to the microphone, I'll simply note that we're into the fourth segment and the nominal topic is whether or not there is a need for regular and more formal communication mechanisms among the state advisory councils. Wally.

Comment -- Wallace Vog, Executive Director, New York

Well, I'm not going to address that, because I think what we have been talking about is a matter which is much more significant. And being as hardnosed as I can be--which is reasonably so--and thinking also in terms of protocol, may I point out that we as a joint group in Scottsdale really said the last word on this matter. And that Congressman Perkins Bill in my judgment implements not only the spirit but also the letter of what we as advisory councils in two days of brain racking in that heated activity determined was the most appropriate way to go that one

step further, if it were necessary, beyond the 1968 amendments. What we are really talking about, it seems to me in Topic One and Topic Two, is the issue of how effectively can we implement what is a national policy in relation to education. But at the same time, not as Roman pointed out, upsetting the constitutional relationships which exist between the federal government and the state governments. Now I think we have all been treading that line reasonably well, if one were to have any criticism, I think it would be what we made in Scottsdale, that we didn't get backing from the U.S. Office of Education--the bureaucrats.

Still that will be what it should when it came to the issue of compensation. Where, when the advisory councils were attempting to see that the state board, the sole state agency, and this is where the linkage comes between Topic One and Topic Two is that one of the major problems I think we face is the fact that in most states we have a state board of education which sometimes puts on another hat and calls itself the state board of vocational education. But it brings with it all the priorities that it has as a state board of education. In my own state we know them well. That in terms of the state board of education, vocational education is one of five priorities. Anyone want to guess which number out of one through five vocational education has in those priorities? Number 5. I think that the bridge here raises the question of do we have enough effectiveness in terms of our mandated powers. I would say yes we do. I think there is no question about that.

And I think in the Perkins Bill the fact that we are required to advise the state board on the development of the kinds of evaluative criteria which shall be used to show whether the job is being done or not gives us that additional edge that we really didn't have in the 1968 amendments. A lot of us knew in 1968 that this might be an area in which we would be in control. Obviously the Congress, in its wisdom, has determined that is being done. Now we move to the next issue. The issue there is should there be a separate board for vocational education. Well, I have to tell you Marv, I'm off the train. Well, I'm abandoning the train that you and I were on, in which we thought it would be possible that state boards of education with a different hat on could, in fact, implement the national policies laid down in the vocational education legislation. The answer is they haven't done it. And I would suggest to my friend, that over an appropriate libation, we might wish to philosophize about this but however it comes out in terms of philosophy, I want to say to you right now that as far as I'm concerned, that as far as my advisory council is concerned, we are very seriously considering that there should in fact be a separate state board solely for vocational education just to keep the general educator honest if for nothing else.

Comment -- Vernon A. Magnesen, Chairman SAC, Illinois

Vernon Magnesen from Illinois. I would like to comment on the CETA concept that was brought up earlier. All of our states I

think are extremely stressed for funds for occupational education. On the other hand, CETA really has lots of money. But the CETA structure makes it very difficult for institutions to work with CETA. For example, I wear a double hat because I'm also a dean of a college. We may not know a week ahead of time whether we are going to have a program. And you try to staff a program with that type of funding. It's always impossible. I visited a school last week that had 800 CETA students in it, doing a very very fine job, but they are thinking of converting to credit hours because of the tentativeness of the CETA funding. All of the faculty are part-time. And you can't run an institution for a long period of time with part-time people. So they are going to try, perhaps, to pull out of CETA, move to occupational funding, take away $350,000 of occupational funds, to do the same job simply because the CETA mechanism is not set up for education. And I don't think we can say that CETA is not our business because it really has great implication for funding. And I think we needed to spend a lot of time working on how we could work together for occupational education.

Comment -- Martha Bachman, SAC, Delaware

I think your comments are very good on CETA. However, I hope that if we are going to have "show and tell" then let's look at Kentucky. Getting about 80 percent of the CETA funds and pulling out to where the money is seems kind of dumb. And I think perhaps

we have been kind of dumb in this whole thing. We have got the stuff to go with the academicians so we are going to pull out from them. Now we are not accomplishing tying up with labor so we are going to pull out from them. And then go down in the basement, we get clean white socks and there we stay.

Can we get together at this meeting and find out from somebody like Kentucky. They get about 80 percent of the CETA funds working in vocational education. How did they do it? How do you infiltrate in that organization? Let's get those funds; let's get going; let's get vocational education right where it belongs; and make it work and not stop dropping out from this and dropping out from that, because they don't like our rules. Let's go with their rules and go get it and serve the kids. Isn't that what we're here for?

Comment, Nevada--Labor Management Representative

You talk about CETA and all those consortia where we spend all that money and we don't utilize the money you're talking about. Because we're like a lot of folks we don't need some of the problems. The things that bother me about CETA, when we talk about people, you get people's goals you tell them you are going to give them some training and you get all done with them and they haven't got it. And they've got to work for 15 years and they can't go get a job because they don't have the skills they need. And we have got

some more implications here too. So when you get into CETA and you find out how people do things, you had better think about evaluation. I'm talking about third party evaluations, not CETA--it evaluates itself.

Comment

I will simply say this that education as we see it, career education, is the corridor of the schools. You can go into any classroom, whether it be mathematics, CETA, athletics or what have you, but nothing really objective comes out of that classroom until it is proved and until it is performed. Our job is, as I see it, to try to make some emphasis of direction out of what appears to be a confusion in the corridors.

Comment -- Martin

I think that's a good point in which to end. Thank you very much. The next meeting is scheduled for executive directors.

Morning Session May 6, 1976

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Dr. Terrell Bell
U.S. Commissioner of Education

Introduction

Fred Hoke (West Virginia Advisory Council)

As executive director with the state advisory council in West Virginia, it has been my priviledge to act as chairman of the ad hoc planning committee for this particular meeting. During the next two days, I will properly announce the members of the ad hoc committee and the NACVE staff who have been so gracious in helping put together what I think is going to be a very informative and useful meeting.

I believe all of us here today realize one thing: to help insure vocational education in this country and to insure the improvement of vocational education, we have to insure the improvement of our own state advisory councils. When Congress mandated the establishment of advisory councils, they were betting that these councils would help insure the integrity of vocational education by systematic and objective evaluation of the delivery system. To this end, I am sure everybody in this room can take pride in their own personal accomplishments with the advisory council and join in with the Biblical phrase, "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed."

I remember in 1972 when I came to the West Virginia Advisory Council, one of the national concerns at that time was how do we improve the image of vocational education. Since that time, vocational education has been improved. But it hasn't been improved

through the use of slick Madison Avenue techniques or inflated or egotistical claims, but by diligent, cooperative efforts with vocational education planners to improve the quality and quantity of both educational programs and the teachers, students, and adults in those programs. But vocational education will have to continue to change. If it does not, it will become stagnant. You will have the opportunity in the next day and a half to see how you can best bring about that changed improvement.

So let us take these two days to pause, to rest, if you can, and to return to your homes refreshed, invigorated, and inspired to work even harder for the continued evolution and improvement of vocational education.

I would like to mention some of the individuals at the speaker's table prior to the introduction of our keynote speaker. We have with us Reginald Petty, executive director of the National Advisory Council, Dr. Duane Lund, acting chairman of the National Advisory Council, and council chairman for West Virginia, James McCartney.

At this time I would like to present to you the Chairman of the Utah Advisory Council, who has been with that council for two years. His name is Orson "Bud" Jacobson. He came to the Utah Council with twenty-five years experience in personnel related areas such as employment training, wage and salary, and labor relations. It is my pleasure to introduce to you Mr. "Bud" Jacobson.

Thank you and good morning. It is my pleasure as well as an honor to welcome Dr. Bell to our conference. Dr. Bell is

Commissioner of Education for our great nation and has held that position for the past two years. I have here with me today four pages of accomplishments and honors that he has received through the years and I don't believe it would be fair to him to go through those this morning. Let me just say to you that as citizens of our great nation, we are fortunate to have had and to have a man like Dr. Bell as Commissioner of Education. Sometime in the future, he will be returning to Utah where he will become Commissioner of Higher Education for the state. When that time comes, Washington's loss will be Utah's gain. I was just talking to Mr. Petty and he expressed a sincere interest in Dr. Bell and the great relationship that they have had in Washington together. Dr. Bell is a real friend of vocational education and has demonstrated that throughout his life. We in Utah, are very much aware of his great interest in that area.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I present to you a great educator, a father, a humanitarian, a patriot, and a great friend of vocational education, Dr. Terrell Bell.

Presentation

Thank you very much, Bud. It is a pleasure to be here and to have this opportunity to speak to all of you and have the honor of giving your keynote address.

The title of my address is "New Outlooks for Vocational Education," and it is a great pleasure to be here with all of you from the state and the national advisory councils. I have met with the National Council, and possibly out of all the councils

that we have in the Office of Education, those that are presidentially appointed, this National Council is one of those few where the members are appointed by the President of the United States. I have found our National Advisory Council on Vocational Education to be, possibly, the most effective council that we have had and it has been a great priviledge to work with this council. I was just thrilled when Reg Petty was selected as your new Executive Director. Reg is a great leader, he has a strong commitment to vocational education, he understands the area thoroughly, and he is an ambitious person who is going to serve you very well. I salute Reg and express my congratulations to the National Council in selecting him as their director.

I think that the vision of the National Advisory Council has helped to raise vocational education to the deservedly prominent position that it enjoys in American education today. In my opinion, one that has been around in education for a few years, vocational education enjoys more prestige at the present time than it ever has.

Early in the National Council's existence, in 1969 to be exact, they issued a report that was a matter of great concern. The National Council in their reports referred to a national sin of intellectual snobbery, a snobbery which held that vocational education is for someone else's children. This National Council made some specific proposals to utilize the potential of vocational education for, to use their language, "Eliminating unemployment, unrest, and violence in our country." Well, we have

come a long way since then. We have met, to a considerable extent, not that it is totally solved, the problem of intellectual snobbery towards vocational education. In this same year, incidentally, the National Council issued a second report which called for directing the disadvantaged into the mainstream of vocational and technical education to enable them to prepare for a career. We have heard some complaints now and again from the disadvantaged that maybe as we urge them to move into vocational education, we are implying that they are not ready for the professions and so on. But that is largely going by the boards now as we find that job related education is called for more attention and more participation and is occupying more prestige than ever before. So I certainly salute the National Advisory Council for its leadership, for the fact that it has never lost sight of the human dimension in vocational education, and for showing discernment and concern for vocational education's role in our society. As I talk about the new prestige that we now have, I certainly don't want to imply that all of our problems are solved; you know better than that. But, as I compare with where we were a few years ago, I would say that we have come a long way and we still have some other problems to work with.

As I emphasize the accomplishments of the National Advisory Council, I would like to just say a few things about the state councils.

I think you have been instrumental in bringing about many of the very dramatic changes that we have seen in recent years in the

nation's approach to vocational education. Most of the state councils that I have seen in action have been active, you might almost use the term "activist," in this regard. You have not been shrinking violets at all and you have come forward and we have had some of the nation's most prestigious people on these state councils. Many of you are recognized and highly accomplished individuals in your own communities. This has helped us to be able to attract the quality that we have had to these state councils. I have appreciated the independent evaluations of the effectiveness of vocational education programs and the services that you have rendered in that regard. I emphasize the term "independent" because some of these state evaluation reports that I have seen certainly exercise that independence. I admire the way you have told it like it is and through that, and through always emphasizing constructive and not negative criticism, I think you have done a great deal to help state boards for vocational education and their administrators, local boards and local school superintendents, presidents of community colleges, and other institutions largely involved in vocational education to move forward in meetint their responsibilities. I think it shows the value of constructive criticism in meeting a great need. As we recognize the problems of employment today, the economic difficulties that we're just seeing are emerging from the depths of this, it is certainly a time for us to appreciate where we have been and size up where we are going in vocational education, I can't think of a more timely meeting than this one to meet the immediate interests

of members of your councils and to meet some of the interests that we have in the United States Office of Education as we express our concern about vocational education. Many of us are concerned about what kind of legislative package will emerge from Congress. Incidentally, the committee has reported out in the House, to the Rules Committee, their proposed new bill and that is going to be scheduled for floor action very soon. The Senate is moving along on their version of the vocational education bill and so we are going to have the proposed new vocational amendments of 1976 on the books before very long. Many of us are wondering what those provisions are going to contain and frankly, I have some concern about some of those provisions and want to express that concern to you. Regardless of the language of the utlimate enactment, however, I think that the legislative give-and-take that we are witnessing will result in better and more effective vocational education. As I have worked with legislative bodies on the state and the federal levels, there were many times that I shook my head and wondered why decisions are made like they are. But I can't devise, in my mind, a better invention than a legislature or a Congree for handling the public's business in a way so demogogery does not take over. So, not withstanding some of the problems that we have, I think there will be some improvements in this vocational act as compared to the previous one.

Dr. Bill Pierce, the deputy commissioner for vocational education, and myself testified before both the House and the Senate on the Administration's proposals on vocational education.

Much of what we presented was an effort to be responsive to criticism of the General Accounting Office. Some of you read, and are familiar with, the GAO report that heavily criticized our operation in vocational education: our lack of what they feel was agressiveness in this area, in their report that was entitled, "What is the Role of Federal Assistance for Vocational Education." I suspect we will never answer that question to the satisfaction of everyone, but maybe we are getting closer to what the majority wants in that regard. We have attempted, in our testimony before the Congress, to define more clearly several ways in which we think the federal role in vocational education can be sharpened, and at the same time, not get more federal control; more federal red tape to add to the paper blizzard. Our proposals seek to spotlight the federal government's catalytic role more sharply. We do this by putting more emphasis than we have had before on program maintenance; where you are matching with state and local monies more than six to one, and where we are seeing the huge federal deficits role-up.

We think we ought to be doing more in a catalytic way to stimulate new directions and new ventures in vocational education. Not that we propose to withdraw our general support on the formula grants, but there will be a considerable amount of emphasis upon innovation and capacity building, program improvement, and new program development in areas where as our economy changes and technology advances, we need to be developing new programs of vocational training in this country. Other efforts on the part of the administration,

will try to simplify state and local administration of federal programs in the area of vocational education to cut down on the specific requirements and to increase the emphasis on meeting vocational education requirements of individuals on the local and state levels. We will do this in a way so that those who are really struggling will be helped. Even today, with the high unemployment rate, we have jobs looking for people at the same time that people are looking for jobs. We need to bring the two together more effectively than ever before.

I might just say that there are two provisions in the proposed act that concern me very much. One is the United States Commissioner's role in settling disputes inside of the states. This provision says that if you have a disagreement, say, between the higher education and the elementary-secondary education board, or between the vocational board and both of those bodies, or any other substantive dispute, that one of the parties can appeal it to the United States Commissioner of Education. He is to hear the case and then call it and that is to be binding on everyone. As I sit in the Commissioner's chair, I can think about how much power that gives you. I frankly believe that we ought to keep the federal government and federal officials out of state disputes. I think that we ought to have a way for settling that, first, by law, and secondly, by having the duly constituted body, whatever body that is, be the one to resolve that. I have a great deal of concern about that provision in the new law. I think maybe there is too much reporting, too much evaluation requirement, and

too much paperwork in the bill. Those are my own views, there are others that I think will express other concerns in that regard and maybe they see some reasons that I do not see for this. But, I would predict that if the bill is passed as it is, within the next couple of years you will be meeting here and climbing all over the new commissioner about all that paperwork. Much of this is caused by the legislation and you have to comply with the law. We need to simplify, streamline, and slenderize our requirements. Particularly, is that so on the federal level where we have to enact a piece of legislation that meets the requirements of fifty different states (you all have different state statutes to administer, you have state provisions for vocational education, as does each of the fifty states and the outlying territories.) It behooves us to have general provisions so that we do not have the federal dollar, which is only one-sixth of the total, wagging the other five-sixths unduly. Now, at the same time, I think the Congress has the right and should prescribe some standards for federal money, but I just raise the question as to whether or not we can be going too far in this regard.

We are concerned about the need for improved planning. We appreciate the provision for planning that is in the bill. Planning is a general thing that I think can adapt to each state in this regard. This new law will require a strengthened forward plan if it is passed in its present form. It is to be developed by the state education agency that is designated by law as being responsible for vocational education, but it is to be done in

cooperation with many others. There is an open planning provision that requires an annual program plan that will detail how vocational education is going to meet the needs of the state. It requires planning and calls for openness and cooperation in the program. I see this as the direction that federal requirements ought to take because they are general in their provisions and they avoid the oppressive specifics that cause problems when you are trying to pass legislation that meets the n-eds of all fifty states. To assist state and local education agencies in these long-range planning responsibilities, the commissioner, under the new law, would annually conduct and publish, for the consideration of the states, an assessment of the critical national needs and high national priorities in vocational education. Now, I think that is as it should be. If the ideas in the commissioner's annual assessment are good ideas, they will be persuasive without mandating that they be laid on you. That is one of the good provisions in the law.

We feel that the time has arrived to break the traditional funding pattern of vocational education in which the federal role has funds that just flow out in a highly categorical way. There are eight or nine different categories now in the law and if you are bound by them, state by state, it is going to be hard for you to adapt in that regard. We want to emphasize more general provisions, we want to emphasize planning, assessment of needs, and give the states leeway to design, adapt, and revise their programs that will provide the skills that are needed on the labor market

in your area. Would that we would learn that lesson as we draft legislation here, and I think we have learned it as I see the legislation coming out at the present time. House Bill 12835 requires that every state be reviewed by 1981 to evaluate how it is using its federal programs. This bill is pointing the need for us to do more in evaluation nationwide and to do more with each state and each territory; to review with the states what they are doing in that regard. We are scheduling a series of five-day reviews with eight states to look at their annual long-range planning, their fiscal and descriptive reports, and to learn from these reports how well the administrators of the program are responding to your evaluations as national councils. We will have review teams of colleagues, not feds with dictator hats on, appraising and sizing up what we are doing in the various states. Hopefully, we will be able to carry out what I think is a good federal responsibility: and that is to spread the knowledge and information about the outstanding programs from one state to another and to make comparative appraisals so that you know how West Virginia compares to Michigan for example, and be able to compare yourself with more than your own state. We are moving now in a more evaluation-dissemination mode than we have ever in the past.

As I have said a little earlier, no one can predict what the final enactment of the 1976 amendments will be. But, the provisions for consolidation of the vocational education programs, I think are good. They are fairly close to what we recommend, Dr.

Pierce and I, when we testified on the legislation. Now the Senate's bill has provisions that are more in keeping with the traditional categorical support. For my part, I hope that we will be able to persuade the Senate to consolidate a little more and not have such detailed categories so the states will have more latitude in how they utilize money to adapt to their needs.

One feature that I think is central to most of the Congressional proposals on vocational education is this matter of governance. In Washington, we have had a lively debate and dispute over this. The community and junior colleges, some of the state colleges, and the agricultural and mechanical colleges are coming on much stronger than ever before about governance. They allege that the control of vocational education and the federal vocational education act is, by and large, in the hands of those that operate the elementary and secondary schools. So, we have had an enormous debate over this on the Hill and I think it has been healthy. For one thing, I think it demonstrates a greater interest on the part of higher education in vocational education and the fact that they are dramatically and agressively concerned. It is a turn-around from what it was in 1968 and at other times when we have had amendments before the group. We are having a more vital and very vocal interest in this legislation. From now on there will be tighter competition between the high schools, the community colleges, junior colleges, other post-secondary institutions, and the post-secondary technical institutes about vocational expenditures and who controls and allocates the federal monies as well as the state

monies. The pulls and pressures of these various interest groups is going to result in the evolution of a broader perspective in vocational education planning and programming. I think, if nothing else happens, it is going to be a more open planning process and more are going to be involved in it. In the long run, it is going to be healthy for vocational education in our country. There are going to be some new broader-based alliances built out of this. We are going to see more entities and more groups involved in vocational education than ever before. Hopefully, we will have closer coordination with the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. Many of us are concerned about how we relate to CETA and, hopefully, we will be able to see better coordination in that regard.

There are many other challenges, as you well know, that face vocational education and these are calling for results oriented thinking: for good will and good counsel on your part as the individuals who sit back and appraise and evaluate the results of federal and state programs in vocational education. If we are to grow, if our mission is to continue to expand, I think it is going to be vitally important that we continue to have your very constructive criticism.

In the past few decades, the nation's concept of equal opportunity for education has expanded dramatically. Congress and the courts have made it clear that the economically and the culturally disadvantaged need to be steered into the mainstream of education, not only in vocational education but in academic

education, and given more access to the professions. More recently, they have taken the same posture concerning the handicapped. We have to be thinking more about vocational education that will meet the needs of handicapped people because there are a lot more of these individuals needing and deserving vocational education than many of us realize. The sex equality movement makes it incumbent on us to squeeze the sex bias out of education. The people who are leading the women's equality movement in this country are demanding that that happen. It is a serious challenge and there is no place where sex bias is expressed much stronger than in vocational education. Many of the old tried and true concepts and ideas and mind-sets have got to go as we look at this new era where we are saying that women are entitled to equal rights in the employment market. We have some mind-sets about certain occupations that are for women. An example of what I mean was uncovered recently by a recent study of career guidance materials that the National Institute of Education conducted. One handbook that NIE examined in their study of sex bias declared that good grooming is a prerequisite for those entering the secretarial field. Well, that is OK, but then this handbook listed the following as the characteristics of good grooming: "Good posture, attractive glasses, manicured hands, smooth arms and legs, and proper girdles to firm the buttocks." If I have ever seen anything that is loaded with sex bias, that is it. There also was a section that advised aspiring female doctors that they would need the "constitution of an ox." I guess that some of us males, who think we are the

stronger sex when we are really the weaker, ought to be told we need the "constitution of an ox" if we want to be a physician. I am sure that these kinds of phrases that are still in many of our manuals today are going to go by the boards, at least I hope that is going to happen. I am telling you that the women in this country are not going to sit back and tolerate that kind of bias in our literature. I urge all of you in the state and national advisory councils to take a look at this. I would emphasize that it is probably not the most serious program in vocational education, but it is a serious one: it is demeaning, it puts people down, and we just ought not to indulge in that.

I would like to share with you some thoughts I have been kicking around for some time about the problems, challenges, and opportunities that are now facing vocational education. It would seem prudent for your national and state councils to address yourselves to some of these, at least if you agree with me. One of my thoughts relates to quality control or the lack of it in our training. I often hear people say that whereas once we had good workmanship under bad working conditions that today we have shoddy workmanship under excellent working conditions. I know that does not apply to everyone, maybe it does not even apply to most of our people out in the vocations, but it applies to enough so that you are hearing more and more about it. There is a message here for vocational educators, and maybe you can help to carry that message. When a neighbor asks, do you know where I can get my car fixed without being ripped off (I don't want to

just focus on the automotive industry because they don't rip-off any more than anyone else), you start to get the feel of what we are talking about regarding quality control. I think some of moral and spiritual values of work need to be emphasized a lot more than they are so that we can point a finger with more pride than we do sometimes to the products of our vocational programs. Pyschologists, teachers, and curriculum developers need to be more deeply involved with the root problem of motivation and pride as we teach job-related educational programs in our schools. Labor unions and management need to get involved in this, and maybe you state advisory council leaders and the national council can help us in this regard. I see it as quite a need at the present time.

Along with the problem of quality, is the need for students to be made aware that they need to make individual contributions to the common good. Too zealous a pursuit of self-interest leads to chaos for both the individual and society. Ideally, we need to be teaching more about the common good and educating more in this regard. As I see some of our great vocational organizations, youth organizations, and clubs, I know that we probably do more in vocational education than other areas.

A third thought that I have revolves around data collection and its interpretation and the use to which we put it. I don't think anyone disputes that the federal and state governments need to collect data to forecast manpower needs and to set up vocational training and education programs that match these

needs. I think we recognize that. My concern is that we not fall into the trap of attempting to pre-plan the future of our citizens and devitalize their job options. We still have an open market and an open job market, and I think we need to be just a little bit careful. We need to heed the voices that warn us that the bureaucractic grip is tightening in the private as well as the public sector, both in state government and in national government. I hope that in vocational education, federal and state funded programs, that we can be more responsive and more concerned about that than we have been in the past. We need to make sure that data collection and interpretation enlighten and enhance the freedom of choices of individuals and employers within the accepted bounds of non-discrimination. At the same time, I think we have a responsibility to advise young people of the probability of the options and the possibilities that are out there so that they do not go up a blind alley. And how much of that we're seeing now: so many with liberal arts degrees out driving taxi cabs, and other majors working in certain areas that are deadends as far as jobs are concerned. I think we have a big responsibility in that area.

My fourth thought has to do with teacher recruitment and the excellent liaison that vocational education has established with business, industry, and labor. We can improve that, but as we compare it with other aspects of education, it is a shining light. If you accept the proposition that the key to good vocational education is good teaching, then I think the efforts to upgrade

methods of teacher recruitment, the calibre of recruits, and the methodology that is employed in the classroom, are very important. This effort should never end and I would hope that as you carry out your evaluative responsibilities and offer criticism, you focus attention upon these. We need to get and keep outstanding vocational teachers and have the kind of in-service training that keeps them up-to-date. We need to provide a good working climate and rewards for them so that we can hold the outstanding people in teaching. There are too many outstanding vocational teachers who are moving to other areas; the good ones, the tremendous ones whom we ought to hold for the lives they can touch.

My final thoughts is that vocational education, now more than ever, needs to demonstrate that it is the most effective way for youths and adults to get a job, to progress up the job ladder, and to enjoy the personal satisfactions that come from being gainfully employed. As you all know, vocational education costs more than general and academic educations. My thought boils down to whether vocational education is really prepared, and I think it is, to justify its cost to the satisfaction of the taxpayers and administrators in these syringent economic times. The public, the taxpayer is looking harder than ever at education costs. I say that is healthy. That kind of stringency, that kind of positive pressure will do a lot to help us in the area of vocational education. The national and state advisory councils with their mandate to conduct reviews and evaluations are in a splendid position to be advocates, to be quality control advocates, to be advocates for improved

movement and momentum in vocational education, and to be advocates for the right commitment for our resources in proper proportions to the area of vocational education.

There are some big challenges facing us as we see a new federal vocational act enacted and as we see vocational education move into a new era in our economy. We all know that our economy is shifting considerably and dramatically, just over the last few years. This is going to place a big order on all of us in education, in job-related education, to work in a way that can help. I can think of no better group to help us to do this than all of you here today that comprise the national and state advisory councils for vocational education. I think, speaking for my perspective as the U.S. Commissioner of Education, that I can, with good conscience, express admiration and the strongest thanks for the great service that you render to all of education, by what you do for vocational education, and the countless hours that you offer to this. We hope you will continue. We hope you will be as agressive in the future as you have been in the past. I am sure you are going to be even more effective in the years to come.

Thank you very much.

Acknowledgement -- Hoke

Thank you Commissioner Bell for taking your time to be with us this morning. I also want to thank you on behalf of the millions of boys and girls and men and women in the country who have

definitely benefitted in their educational programs by your leadership. I also want to thank your special assistant, Jim Kessler, for coming over with you this morning.

Morning Session

May 6, 1976

PANEL: VIEW OF SACVE FROM OTHER AGENCIES

Introduction

I suppose in about every meeting that you have attended to discuss vocational education, the conversation has turned to this question, "How can we better coordinate our council activities and vocational planning to other agencies?"

One answer is always, "make every effort to get involved with those agencies." However, you realize that how well you are able to work with other agencies is, in no small measure, dependent upon how those agencies view you and your role and your state advisory council.

This morning we have invited three different agencies to help us see ourselves through their eyes. We have not asked these agencies to give us a briefing on their agency, but to challenge us and to inform us on how, through cooperative efforts, advisory councils can become even more efficient in helping promote and safeguard the quality of vocational education. We asked these individuals for a frank and open assessment of how their agency views us. The comments you hear should help you strengthen vocational education by strengthening the operation of your own council.

We have with us this morning Sandy Kisla, acting director of Employment and Training Program, National Governor's Conference; August W. Steinhilber, assistant executive director, Office of Federal Relations, National School Boards Association; and Richard Reuben, deputy director, Policy and Planning, U.S. Department of Labor.

In order to structure an unstructured meeting, let me ask that we begin by asking Sandy Kisla for her presentation and then we will have Richard Reuben and Mr. Steinhilber. At the conclusion, these people have graciously said that they would try to react to questions from the audience.

(Sandy Kisla, Acting Director, Employment and Training Program, National Governor's Conference)

The national and state advisory council on vocational education was created to assure citizen participation in the decision-making process. To a governor, this citizen participation is politically, practically, and operationally sound. No one person can be an expert on every subject. Nor can he look at any one topic from all the different angles that a group of people can look at them. For that reason every governor has many, many, many advisory councils reporting either to himself or to various state agencies under his jurisdiction. Obviously, some advisory councils are better than others. Some are more listened to than others and some are more effective than others. The effectiveness of an advisory council is dependent on the quality of its membership, the quality of its leadership, and the relevancy and credibility of its work product. Every council member of any council should be deeply concerned about the subject matter under his/her purview, and equally concerned about the abilities of the council, as a whole, to effect the maintenance or expansion of good programs, or any changes that they seem to think may be

required. It is important to remember that advisory councils, in their ultimate role, do not deal in a vacuum. Whether you are reporting to a state director, a state board, or an elected official, final outcomes on any issue are really related to many influences. A governor's overriding interest is not vocational education, not CETA, not general education, not welfare, not commerce, not highways, nor any of the other myriad of services that states are expected to provide, but rather, the most effective use of all of the resources in his jurisdiction. In these budget-trying times, all areas have to be considered and weighted against a total budget. We are in an economic situation right now that demands the best coordination and the best usage of every resource that is available. The interlocking and the stretching of every possible, affordable service is of the utmost importance. States, right now more than ever before, are being faced with some very hard decisions to make. This makes the role of all advisory councils even more important that it has ever been before.

From the way that I see the state advisory council on vocational education, it is to advise the state board for vocational education on the development of the state plan and the policy for the administration of that plan; just the policy, not the actual administration. And, also to evaluate the vocational education programs, services, and activities with their written annual reports. It is very similar in structures and function to the state Manpower Services Council, and before anybody gets nervous about my bringing that up, I did not say that they were identical

in structure or function, they are certainly not identical in purpose. Both advisory councils are important. Yet, from the state's standpoint they are related. In fact, from the state's standpoint, all advisory councils are related in that they are all supposed to make administration of the state more effective, and to better afford all of the citizens in that state a better life. There is a relationship between every advisory council. Of course, that thought brings you back to my pet word, "coordination." I firmly believe that coordination is absolutely essential to make any progress in solving the problems that states are facing today. As I have said many times before, I am not talking just about the coordination of CETA and vocational education. The answer to today's unemployment problems don't lie in CETA; they don't lie in vocational education. Neither one is the total answer to the problem. There are seven and one-half million unemployed people out there. There is no way either one of these systems can ever solve a problem like that. The existing situation, the unemployment situation today, has a multifaceted cause, and it needs a multifaceted cure. There are many things that have to be done, many existing things that have to be improved to solve the problem.

My efforts deal basically with coordination in the manpower-related areas, but always in relation to whatever efforts are being made in every other area. Again, the work that I am doing, and the work that you are doing on your councils is not work being done in a vacuum. We all have to be aware of the total situation;

what everyone else is doing. It is only in our coordinated efforts with every other system that we are going to get back to where we want things to be. For that reason, I am particularly pleased to see those provisions that are in the pending vocational education legislation right now that would mandate cross-representation on the vocational education council and the SMAC, and the provision to review each other's plans. That is a great beginning and certainly a big step forward. Although, I think it is a shame that we had to have that Congressionally mandated. I think I would have been really pleased if we'd been able to do that all on our own, without having to be told to do it by Congress. But, nonetheless, it is there, it is good, and I urge you to seriously look at your responsibility to coordinate efforts and iron out problems through mutual efforts by both councils. It can only better your abilities as a council member. It can only better your council. It can better the entire state system and it can certainly, and most importantly, provide for the better services for those people who need them.

(Richard Reuben, Deputy Director, Policy and Planning, U.S. Department of Labor)

I happen to be one of the representatives of the Labor Department in and on an advisory council. As such, I can see the work that you do from the perspective that you see it. But, I can also see the role of the federal agency in trying to carry out a legislative mandate and the need to fulfill the responsibilities given

to that agency by the Congress, and how that relates to the roles of advisory councils such as yours and the one I am a member of, the one on extension continuing education. However, we as an agency have to stick to our primary goals which are mandated by the Congress. In our instance, the Labor Department's primary educational program efforts now are those under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973. Under prior legislation we developed over a period of perhaps ten years, stronger and stronger dependence upon community groups. We needed to hear what the community and the target groups that we were dealing with wanted and how these related to the program efforts that we conducted. Under those pieces of previous legislation, we had essentially total control: we were running federal programs through state agencies, whether they were education agencies or labor agencies, and we called the shots. It was only in the last two or three years of the conduct of those programs that the role of advisory groups at the local and state levels really began to have impact. And, as that impact grew, we began to transfer responsibility more and more to the local and state level. This culminated in enactment of CETA in 1973. A brief run through as to what the provisions of CETA are might be helpful and then I will go back and show how these things have applied in the operation of CETA in related to advisory groups, those which are of a general nature and those which are mandated by law.

CETA provides for programs of job training for the unemployed and underemployed individuals. In addition to job training, it can

provide a full range of supportive services of any nature that is deemed advisable by the administering agencies. Those agencies are termed prime sponsors, at least so far as Titles One and Two go. A prime sponsor is the delivery agent representing the federal government, the Labor Department, in particular. The prime sponsor, as you know, can be a state, a unit of local government over 100,000, or a combination of such governments. In some instances, you have a balance of state prime sponsor that make up the areas of the state that are not 100,000 or over. The services that can be provided under Title One are outreach, assessment, orientation training, O.J.T. type training, supportive services, labor market information, and public service employment. Under Title Two, you have public service employment. Under Title Three, which is conducted at the national office level, you have special programs for groups that the Congress is specifically concerned with and felt could not be dealt with at the local level, such as migrants, Indians, etc.; plus research and development activities, labor market information program, and others conducted on a national basis.

In working with the Congress in the development of the CETA legislation and having had experience with MDTA, we felt it was essential that we have this type of input from advisory groups. But, we felt that they should be integrated into the structure of the operation rather than being dependent upon the whims of local circumstance as they had been under MDTA and other types of earlier legislation. If we are going to give up, in essence,

some degree of national level control, we were going to make sure that the local administration of these programs would be responsive to the populations that they served and relevant to the needs of those communities or to the state. Therefore, we mandated a dual system of advisory councils which actually have a dual advisory and operational role. At the local level, you have the prime sponsor's planning councils. These had mandated representation which was quite similar to that which we had under MDTA, but which shifted the balance of power in essence. Under MDTA, the programs at the local level were developed with some local advice, but the real control rested with the educational authorities, with the Labor Department in its guise as state employment security agency. Now, we have a shift. We still have the local community action groups, we have women, non-English speaking, and the same employment service representation, education group, business, and labor. But, we have found in the studies that have been done so far, that the real control in these groups at the local level is with the non-government groups. In practical workings, at the local level, CETA is still in the control of the administrative staffs of the prime sponsors. They are the people who are running it. But the people who they are listening to first are the community groups that are part of these mandated advisory councils. At the state level we have state manpower services councils. Their role is merely advisory, but the practical elements are coming to fore. Remember we have only had a couple of years of full operation of these programs and it is very hard to determine where they are

going yet. We are beginning to see a certain pattern at the state level just as we are seeing at the local level. In the case of the SMSCs, we are finding that the control, at this point, of these advisory councils is in the hands of the representatives of the local prime sponsors rather than with the representative groups such as our own agencies. The prime sponsors at the state levels have shown the most influence, with a lower role for the state agencies and an even lesser role for the general population groups. Considering the fact that these state councils are the ones that have oversight functions over all the local programs that are being developed and have the authority and the responsibility to report deficiencies, not only as to CETA programs but to state agency programs and to local government manpower-related activities, it is really essential that the voice of the people be heard. One of the groups that is not adequately represented are the other advisory councils that already exist in these areas, such as yours, and the numerous groups that represent various other manpower-related or education-related activities. Until now, we have found that what we are getting is planning at a very localized level. At the local area level they are dealing primarily with narrow labor markets, rather than looking at the broad perspective of an entire metropolitan area. They are focusing on the needs, of their own immediate jurisdictions. This has to be broadened and it would probably be better if we could get some of the state level advisory councils to pressure on this point: to make the prime sponsors coordinate their programs as was stated earlier.

We are not getting adequate coordination among the local prime sponsor plans because the state manpower councils are not yet fully effective in urging and enforcing the required coordination of the local prime sponsor's plans. The most important thing about the advisory council system in CETA is that it has integrated that system into the very structure of the operation of the program; that there is no way of separating the advisory council role of the planning council role from the operation of the program. The prime sponsor may be king, but he has a council, and that council has a voice and authority and we want that authority to be maintained and to be enforced.

(August W. Steinhilber, Assistant Executive Director, Office of Federal Relations, National School Boards Association)

I am going to start off with a story. One of the three biggest lies you will ever hear in your life first comes from your faculty advisory, who says take this course it is going to be good for you. The second comes from your dentist who says this is going to hurt me more than it is going to hurt you. And, the third is an HEW official who says, I've come here to help you. And that is a bias of our association.

I would like to discuss what local elected boards of education view your role as, how they view you, a little bit of the politics involved in that, and a little bit of the politics as to how it has splashed over into the national scene.

First, of all your role. Your role, as we see it, is that of advisory. You are not operational. You are not running programs. You are advisory. You serve a very important function in being advisory. You tell when things are going wrong and how they are going wrong. You can point out weak spots in programs. You can point out duplication and overlapping. You can show where coordination is necessary. However, you are not operational. We would object if you got into the operational. Why would we object? Quite bluntly, you are not accountable. You can walk away if you make a mistake. There is nobody going to point a finger at you, saying that it is your big mistake and you have to live with it, because the operational state board of education is the one that is going to have to run the program and be accountable in the long run. Therefore, when it comes to the position of our association, we will say we want advisory committees and councils at the state level, but they are to be advisory. Then you go to the duly appointed, elected, selected, state board of education (by the way, I do not represent state boards of education. I represent local boards of education), and the state commissioner of education in vocational education to administer the program. If we, at the local level, want somebody's head on the line, if we want to hold somebody accountable, that is where we can hold somebody accountable.

Second question of where you are vis-a-vis us: one of the amendments that we are putting through (that Senator Beall put through on the Senate side and Carl Perkins on the House side)

is to have local school board members on state advisory councils. Strangely enough, you'll hear a school board representative say we want local teachers on state advisory councils. Why that weird kind of combination where NEA and NSBA join forces on an issue? Very simple. We think that you need some kind of expertise on what it is like operating at the local level so that not all of your advice is given in an esoteric fashion: not all of your advice comes from afar. We want local board members and local teachers who are going to end up with some responsibilities to be able to give advice at the beginning. Therefore, we are going to push strong and hard for that kind of input at the state advisory level.

We have concerns with some of the things that have been going on recently. One of the concerns is CETA, and in general manpower. We think that the situation of prime sponsors being government agencies, "general purpose" units of government, is somewhat rediculous. We think that there are other mechanisms that can be used in the training, in vocational education, and in manpower training. Therefore, you are going to hear us either using you or talking to you in terms of coordination with CETA programs and Manpower programs. We will be taking a legislative front in order to say that the local prime sponsor cannot be just the governor, the mayor, or the city council, but also should be junior and community colleges and local school districts that have vocational-technical centers.

We are somewhat concerned about the advice we keep hearing about public service employment. The reason we are concerned is the fact that public service employment is very fine in terms of one aspect of the economy, namely the aspect of trying to find jobs to decrease unemployment. There we support public service employment in every size, shape, and form. However, this has taken a slightly different twist in recent days. Now we hear that we should get into a massive training program to train people for public service employment. Now, quite frankly, if you have been looking at what has been happening in terms of public service employment, what has happened with respect to the voter revolt, what has happened to issues, not just with schools but with general purpose units of government: the amount of dollars there is very limited and the number of applicants is very high. On one score we can support very strongly public service employment as a way of handling unemployment. But we think some mistakes are being made in beginning to train people in this realm, considering the economy that we now have. In effect, we are beginning to train people for jobs that do not exist, for a market that is going to be decreased. In the school business, we have as many as thirty to forty applicants for every position that we have open. Why train more? I'm not just talking about teachers. Most people forget that school districts have a bigger food service program than most cities and towns; have a bigger transportation program than most cities and towns; and have a bigger maintenance program tha most cities and towns. Therefore, we are saying that

as an employer of these, be careful of which way those training programs are going. Do not keep heading into what we call dead-end positions.

I have another kind of concern which is very political. It is called grantmanship. To begin with, we see no different between grantsmanship at the federal level and grantsmanship at the state level. It makes no difference to a local school district whether it applies to the Office of Education for a grant or to the state capitol for a grant because what you are going to get is what I call a bandaid approach. You are also going to have a very inefficient program. Inefficiency, why? Because a lot of school districts are going to spend a lot of money developing programs that are never going to come into being because the dollars are not there. So they are going to get into the grantsmanship game and spend a lot of time and effort just making applications and playing the paperwork game. Second, what I call the bandaid approach, is what happens to these programs. The vagaries of spending in either the federal or state level because of a grant-in-aid approach means that we are going to put a bandaid on it so that it is not going to affect the regular program at the elementary and secondary level. If the funding exists for two years and at the third year ceases to exist, we can remove it like a bandaid without ever having any other worry because it was not integrated. Why integrate it? After two years that money may or may not continue and that is how we will be operating as long as you go that grant-in-aid approach. Fact of life.

The result is that you are going to hear comments from school boards and school board associations relating to a term called local entitlement. That is where a state board sets up a state plan, the advisory committees advise on how that state plan goes through, but where local school districts, if we are talking about vocational education, are guaranteed a set amount of money each year. The state plan will devise how that money is to be spent, but there has to be some kind and manner in which a local school district can plan reasonably for what it is going to be getting. Then the plan has to be in concert with the state plan and, of course, with your responsibilities.

Now, I realize that I have given you some hard issues because in some ways we are joining forces with you on issues. While all wisdom does not emanate from Washington, neither does all wisdom emanate from the state capitol.

Thank you.

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question

Mr. Steinhilber, I have been waiting for quite a while to ask this question of you. I represent school boards and I would like to know why the National School Boards Association would support a coalition of agencies that are fighting to get more federal vocational education funds for the post-secondary level at the expense of the secondary schools? I think at the time that this amendment came up and we read the bill, we were very disturbed to find that the National School Boards Association was in league with a very powerful group. It included the NEA, the State Chiefs School Officers, and I am sure you knew who all the rest of them were, and very few of them were aware of what the amendment really contained. Once the State Chiefs School Officers were alerted to this, they withdrew from this coalition and I quote from the Manpower and Vocational Education Weekly, where the Council of Chiefs State School Officers, "last week submitted recommendations opposing any move by the federal government to require a uniform state program administration instead of urging state flexibility in operating voc. ed. programs through their state education departments. In addition, the Chiefs recommend that additional planning councils, if deemed

necessary, be appointed by and report to state education officials: stay out of administration and not be required in addition to voc. ed. advisory councils."

But in particular, I would really like to have you answer the first question.

Steinhilber Response

There is a problem with your question because your question only relates to the Senate bill and does not relate to the House bill. As anybody in politics knows, what happens on the Senate side is not necessarily what happens on the House side because you have a set pattern already in being. So you have a bill already in existence and the question is what do you do with that bill to amend it and then what do you do to the House bill to amend it and what do you do in conference.

The question in vocational education on post-secondary education has two ramifications. The question is dollar amounts and governance. How do you say that dollar amount and governance are related? Well, they are related because, on one score, if post-secondary schools are represented in your national and state advisory councils, then they will not be pushing for a percentage set aside in dollars. I love that letter that was sent out by AVA that we were part of the "diabolical plot." The only problem was that the letter was both incorrect, inaccurate and, quite frankly, I thought led many people astray. The position of the National Schools Boards Association was not to increase the

post-secondary role in terms of dollar amount. Our position was very blunt that post-secondary education, the junior and community colleges, should be represented by state advisory councils: should have some representation because it makes little sense to have a junior community college running a voc-tech center, an area voc-tech center run out of the state department of education, and a manpower program being run by a local county which had virtually the same kind of programs. It did not really make much sense. What probably would make sense is that they were all represented on the state advisory council.

Your information is incorrect. We did not support an advisory council for post-secondary education. What we did say was, in order to resolve the problem, post-secondary education should be represented on your state advisory council.

Questioner's Response to Answer

Sir, it has been all along.

Steinhilber's Response

Anybody here from New Jersey? Do you have a problem in New Jersey, don't you on post-secondary education?

Questioner's Response

Yes.

Steinhilber's Response

I can start naming states. I picked New Jersey only because I'm originally from New Jersey and I have a lot of friends there.

Question

Sir, might we have a show of hands as to the states that do have post-secondary representation on their councils.

Steinhilber's Response

So why are you worried? Just because you want it mandated? So if you have it you're in conformance with the law?

Question

Mr. Steinhilber, could you give use some idea of how we could convince the local and state boards of education that our federal dollars are not "band-aid" dollars but seed money?

Steinhilber's Response

I do not know that that can be done because we have been burnt too many times. I'll tell you how the burning starts with federal dollars. First of all, what takes place is that we have a program, normally for three years. During which time, you will end up with certain numbers of teachers who are "federal program coordinators." At the end of three years, if they are not designated as federal program coordinators, they then end up with tenure. Now, we have a decreasing enrollment and more teachers. And, at the same time, the local taxpayer is saying, "I'm not going to

pay for the additional amount of money." I am willing to talk on how we are going to increase the tax base and how we are going to equalize expenditures with state-aid programs in a better way than we are. Board members know exactly what I say when I say that the tax base is limited and it is very difficult to go back saying the federal dollars are state dollars that have ceased to exist. Now we are going to ask you, the local taxpayer, to increase your local property tax so this can be integrated into the entire system. That is a hard argument to make and you know it.

Question

Some commentators on CETA have pointed out that the expenditures in the program are disproportionate. That 86 percent of the total money is utilized for public service employment and only 14 percent is used for a combination of training and administration. Yet the act is titled the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. I am not sure of the validity of that criticism, I would just like to know if either of the panelists who mentioned CETA in a technical sense would have any clarification.

Reuben's Response

Well, I just happen to have the budget here. First, I'll make a general observation: we all know what the economy has looked like for the last two years. There was enacted an additional title, Title VI, to CETA, which was not an original part of it. CETA was a public service employment program, pure and simple. We have

advocated that it come to a natural end by 1977 because of this slowly climbing unemployment rate. At the same time, over the last couple of years in addition to those funds which they got specifically for public service employment under Titles Two and Title Six, prime sponsors have used a lot of their Title One money for public service employment because there was not private employment available. The 86 percent thing, I don't know where they ever got that figure. I would have to go back and check it out. The way it was laid out, you had Title I for 1976 averaging in broad figures about one billion five hundred and eighty million dollars. Title Two, which was for public service, was only 400 million. Title Three programs really are not relevant because none of that really goes to public service employment. We had a summer youth program if you want to call that a form of public service employment. And, then we had the huge Title VI, which was one billion, six hundred and twenty million, which was almost the size of Title I. The proportion was high but I would have to go back and ask some of the people from the program offices as to whether it ever got to that figure.

Where did you get that figure, sir?

Questioner's Response

Those figures have been kicking around in conversation for awhile. The reason I am raising the question is that you are reading from the budget figures and you are pointing out that Title I, which was originally intended for training, was used

in some noticeable part for public service employment and the comments related to actual expenditures. The point being that what was planned might have been one thing, but the actual expenditures and the proportion of them spent throughout the fifty states turned it into a public service employment program.

Reuben's Response

I can assure you that this was not the intent of the legislation, it was not the intent of the Department in having the program administered. It was no one's intent. It was not the intent, really, of the prime sponsors. What happened was that when it came down to it, you are responsible and the mandate of the law says that you are to direct your programs toward employability and there are no jobs in the private sector, and the only jobs that are there are the kind of jobs that we are all criticizing: low-level dead end jobs. In essence, what they did was turn to increasingly proportionate use of Title I funds for public service employment. We are assuming that this will decline and, in fact, have been told to make sure it declines.

Questioner

That isn't really even the issue. The issue isn't the 85 percent.

Kisla's Response

The 85 or 83 percent figure that you mentioned is just totally off base right from there

First of all, you have to remember that CETA is two separate parts: the original CETA, which was the Comprehensive Act and then Title VI which was added a year later which was Congress' reaction to the unemployment problem. There are those of us that never believed that Title VI belonged in CETA; not that we didn't believe that there should be a Title VI or not that there shouldn't be such a program. But, that was not CETA. CETA is much more a training bill. It is not a public service employment bill. When we were working on CETA during the time that it was originally written, only Title II was to deal with public service employment. It is a comparatively, even if you look at the figures which he stated, a small funded portion in comparison to the other parts of the bill. It is only $400 million in comparison to a little over $2 billion when you take the rest of the act into consideration. Some Title I money is being used for public service employment now. Some Title I money is being used for vocational education, even though vocational education money is not necessarily to come from that part. CETA was supposed to be locally determined to meet local needs.

Just one little point on the public service employment part and the difference between II and VI that I really hope will stay in your minds. Title II, public service employment, was always to deal with structural unemployment. We have had to face the fact that no matter how good our economy gets, we are probably going to need some small amount of public service employment. That will probably exist no matter how well we train them.

There is going to be a need for some type of public service employment. Title VI is a totally different matter. It was supposed to be short-lived. It is not going to be around too much longer. The money that is spent under Title VI really should not be included in the total CETA consideration of funds. When you are talking about the money that is being used for public service employment under CETA as a whole, Titles I through V, there is the $400 million in Title II and maybe close to one hundreed million out of the Title I that is being used for that, too, and more like two billion that is being used for training.

Question

Paul Tschetter from Colorado State Council. Two questions. The first one being, at the recent meeting in San Francisco, some of us had the impression, and I would like to correct or confirm it, that the National Association of School Boards is, in fact, anti-vocational education and would like to work in the direction of putting those funds in with general education. The second question relates to the two persons representing the CETA aspects and that is, however good a federal law may be and mandated, the real crux of the matter is in communications. Especially as it relates to the promulgating and making of rules and regulations to enforce the mandate. I think at that level, Sandy and Mr. Reuben, we need a great deal more work in getting the input from the rest of us who also have an interest. In the health field, which is the thing that I am acquainted with, it is entirely possible to have

a certain mandate, federally mandated, and the rules and regulations come out and the law is actually changed to a completely new thing.

Reuben's Response

Let me answer the first part of your question. To my knowledge, there was no comment at all on the first issue because one of the resolutions that was passed by our delegates' assembly was in support of vocational education. So, I do not know where you got that. I'll repeat myself, I really object to the letter that was sent out that, I contend, contained more mistruths and lies about our association. But it had a very unusual repercussion. The repercussion was that a number of our state school board associations got that and got the correct information and the net result is our association probably has become stronger in terms of credibility with our own membership as a result of that letter. Quite frankly, the answer is no. But there is a correlary question which really relates back to the question that was asked just before. We are trying to get vocational education integrated into the regular program, both in terms of the career education concept and in terms of career opportunity. And, we have run into a very unusual situation. The unusual situation is that certain groups who always said that they were the stepchild, say, what are you trying to do, take us over, as soon as we show an interest. That's not the case because there is no way that we are going to represent a small group, and I don't mean that in a majority sense, there is no way that we can, as a national association,

represent the English teachers, or the Spanish teachers, or the vocational education teachers. But, what we are interested in though, is bringing together that part of the day-to-day operation of all school systems.

Kisla's Response

I wanted to make a comment on that last question or last statement and thank you very much for bringing up the point again that it is communications and coordination that is so important to this whole issue.

First, I know every time I stand up any place I am associated with CETA. I don't really know why because CETA is not my thing in particular. In fact, when I was hired into this job, part of the reason that I was hired was that my first four years on the Hill were working for Congressman Perkins and Jack Jennings operation down in the subcommittee. Then I worked for the next two years with Mr. Daniels' subcommittee on CETA. So, I feel that my background very much qualifies me for both areas. My interest certainly lies in both areas. As the national governors' conference has been going through quite an upheaval this year, I think that some of the communication and coordination things are finally going to come to fruition. I have very recently, gotten a staff associate and a secretary, both of whom will be assigned to the matter of the State Manpower Services Council and its relationship to other councils. Over the year we intend to publish a guide to our state manpower services councils stating

what they are doing. We intend to publish a book on the governor's four percent fund, which is the four percent of CETA funds that a governor can do just about anything he wants with, the one percent on the SMSC, and the five percent on vocational education. Those are all considered coordination issues. If the development of our program continues as it is going, we will have a director for our CETA operation and a director for our coordination effort. During the course of the next year, I will be calling on you once more to continue the things that we started earlier this year. Of the points that came out so strongly in our meetings earlier this year, the one that we want to get into immediately is the planning cycle problem. Secondly, we need a joint working on the regulations from both sides to ease the situation. If anyone here has suggestions or ideas that they would like to get to my office to be considered during our planning process, we would very much welcome any comments that anyone wants to send in to us.

Question

The regulations of CETA are under revision right now. We have never noticed in the past when they have gotten published, preliminary publication there has been dead silence. Communications aren't very good, but it does require the people make their positions clear at the time that these things are published. I think we are all aware that regulations are too voluminous and too detailed . . . some you really don't like. What we want are some specifics. Do you either write to the department or go directly to your organization?

Kisla's Response

I appreciate your comments and if I get back to the office, the regulations will be written up today and the DOL. But one of the things I just want to make up, and this has been a real change of pace in our relations with the Department of Labor, which I assume is the same as yours with H.E.W. When we had our meetings back in February and March we spent a lot of time talking about the administrative cost sections in our CETA regulations for the vocational education money. We were talking about what allowable costs were and what they were not. We had a lot of problems and a lot of discussions during our meetings on that matter. The Department of Labor this year, before, during the course of them writing the regulations called us and other big groups to send in representatives to work on those regulations before they were written. When they came out about three weeks ago, we were very pleased with some of the changes. We think you will be too. There were a lot of things in there that we very much wanted to see. I think all of us who participated in those meetings this year played a part in that.

Question

I'm from the New Jersey State Advisory Council. I would like to raise a question with Mr. Reuben.

Mr. Reuben, even though CETA talks about the prime sponsor planning councils, and how they should operate, what do you do to make sure they are operating in that fashion? Prime sponsors have

overall dictatorial control, and have no public involvement, as I know it, in many local councils.

Reuben's Response

We are just getting some feedback on the effectiveness of CETA and we're running an in-house evaluation, we are paying our fees out to various contractors to look at it. This program isn't very old, and the thing is developing. I wish I'd brought it. There was one of the more interesting things, was a study of several specific local prime sponsors in the way they organized their programs, and the way they got down to the way these local councils work. They were concentrating on six specific localities. The range of the effectiveness of the councils, ranged from almost a total dual participation with the prime sponsor to nothing. They were called in to look at the plan after it had been developed and once a year they signed it and it is never seen again. The law lays the responsibility on the prime sponsor. The regulations lay out what the role of these councils are suppose to be, what the local input is to be. We sic our regions on them. We do all that kind of good things. But you get down to the point where unless we begin to start mandating, the very thing that Congress does not want us to do, the very thing that is not politically viable when you are dealing with a governor or a mayor.

Your suggestion earlier, sir, making the prime sponsors out of community colleges. It would be a lot easier to threaten a school board perhaps than it would be to threaten the mayor of

Philadelphia. But the practical realities are that these councils are as effective as the prime sponsor really will let them be. And that the Department of Labor has its hands deliberately tied, and the furthest we can go is to write in the regulations, who's suppose to be there, what they are suppose to do, how they are suppose to do--be utilized. If the prime sponsor does not want to utilize them, it puts us in a bind. The only thing we can do is take away his money. You as a citizen can review the plan. You as a citizen can bring charges. There are provisions under the law which indicate the plan was not properly drawn, that the input on the council was not listened to. You are a representative of a little community group, or an organization or as a private individual can do it. But we from the departments level find it very difficult, unless you bring it from the local level up. I think that is really the answer, the more I get into it. The answer is the responsibility for dealing with the prime sponsor who will not make use of his council is yours. Because there are provisions in the law, in the regulations by which you can hold him responsible for non-compliance. And that is a form of non-compliance, if he does not utilize his council. But one warning, the decisions, the final decisions are his, that these are advisory councils, and keep the objections restricted to those things where there has been really a flagrant abuse, rather than the fact that he didn't agree with you.

To you the people from the Department of Labor.

Question

You talked about the need for a coordination of programs between H.E.W., and you stressed the need for coordination at the state and local level. Now are you comfortable with the spirit of coordination that you find in federal departments? Particularly, at the decision-making levels?

Reuben's Response

It really depends on the specific instance with which you are dealing. I worked with H.E.W. directly. They use to call me H.E.W.'s boy. I got along with them. When they did the evaluations of the old institutional programs, which was the program I was in, they always said the program worked in spite of itself because the staff got along well with each other and worked with each other. We ignored all the reasons why you couldn't do things. Our main relationship with H.E.W. is through CETA. H.E.W. has been put into a lesser role. You had a year or two of adjustment as they realized that they had lost a certain amount of administrative role to the Labor Department. A lot of good relationships died both at the national and the regional level, where there was strong personal relationships and good intent. I think after the first year things are beginning to get a little better now. We are beginning to really deal with them and our intent has improved; their intent has improved. We are not satisfied and I don't think you can have any kind of degree of satisfaction where there is a split responsibility; particularly the proportion

is like 95:5, in terms of authority. Always the person who is 5 is going to come out on the short end. But I think the intent is there and we are dealing with them on a regular basis at our program office level. In fact, as an example of this, because the relationships were so difficult at the first year as H.E.W. realized what was happening, that they were no longer in control of the major sector of the CETA program at the federal level. We had to set up a kind of intermediary and they used me as the guide, because I wouldn't argue with them and we could sit down and at least mediate and get the point over with. It has now evolved where the program staffs of H.E.W. agencies, and there are so many of them, come and work with our people at the program office level on a face-to-face basis and they work on the regulations together with them where it's relevant; they work on program review in our Title III programs; they deal with them at the national office level when there is a regional office problem that they don't dissolve. I think things are picking up.

Question

To the gentleman from National Association of School Boards.

We hear in our state and we hear you this morning that vocational education needs to be integrated mainstream, the separatism removed, but we hear very little said about what these mean. And my question is "Are we making vocational education--general education?" and I'd like to hear your response.

Steinhilber's Response

I would hope we are not making vocational education general education depending upon your definition. Because I think there is a very decided distinction between--Sid Marland did a lot by coining the phrase "career education"--and I think there is a large difference between providing those youngsters the necessary information about career programs--call it occupational programs--call it career programs--that real world that exists out there whether it be doctor, dentist, plumber or what have you. I think there is that kind of concept which we do want to be called general education and in those terms we want that concept included in general education, so that we use the old expression that existed about eight or ten years ago has to be relevant. But if you are suggesting that vocational education--and what I say here is strictly job training programs--should that be subsumed into general education, the answer is obviously not. Now how do you go about this training--or this coordination? That is a very difficult job because the schism that existed between the "general education" and special concerns and including physically and mentally handicapped. The three schisms or two schisms in three groups, the vocational education is special to the children and the "general education" has existed and indeed NSBA has one of its directives that we received from our delegates literally three years ago is trying to develop some sort of system of programs and communications in among our own local school districts to start to bring those forces together. And quite frankly one of the repercussions of that has been the discussion that has existed over the Vocational Education Act.

For the first time we are now taking a look at it and trying to find out what makes sense in terms of developing that, not as a separate program, not as something divorced from the rest of the education system, but one which is distinct for the needs of those children is their button that is put into the school system in such a way that the stigmatism of vocational education does not continue anymore.

Reuben's Comment

I just want to make one more outsider's observation, now that I see what is going on today. As I indicated earlier, I'm one of the members of the few national advisory education councils which has actual federal representation on it--it's a little one. And you wanted to know when you invited us all here, that I substitute at the last minute, what was our Department's view of these councils? And I'll have to say that from my participation and having seen what's been going on over a year or so taking a very active role in that council is that for a department like the Labor Department which is outside the educational community and I'm sure there are a lot of other outsiders, the word is merely "confusion" and dismay. The council I belong to is made up of some of the most conscientious people I've ever seen and these characters are really very high powered characters and they come from all over the country and spend a lot of time fighting among ourselves and come up with something substantive on the issues we've been told to deal with.

But I have sat in the Statler Hotel and there have been meetings going on of two other education councils and the best we can do is sometimes have a coffee hour together and we have a hard time being non-educational people, figuring out what the difference really is between the two councils' mandates, or three councils' mandates, much less why they don't talk to each other. In listening to some of this, which is a lot of internal things which I don't even understand, if you want to increase your influence you'd better start talking to each other and doing the coordinating--we have used that word a lot. We'd better start doing it among the various education councils and then people like us will be able to understand you and utilize you better.

Afternoon Session

May 6, 1976

REPORT FROM THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Introduction (Fred Hoke--West Virginia Advisory Council)

Our part of the program will involve two major portions, two presentations. First I'd like to introduce the members of our council and the staff, then we'll have a report from Dr. Duane Lund, our acting chairman of the activities of the council and then we have a presentation from Dr. Marvin Fellman who you all know, which will be a response to the Grubb-Lazerson paper which was in the Harvard Review which you are aware of and have been talking about. This I think you will find extremely interesting.

First I'd like to introduce to probably just a few of you and renew the acquaintance with the remainder of you, those members of the advisory council. To my left Ms. Jo Ann Cullen from Pennsylvania; Ms. Caroline Hughes from Oklahoma; Ms. Margo Thornley, Washington; Dr. Russell Graham, Kansas; Mr. T. A. "Tucker" Jackson, South Carolina; Mr. Roman Pucinski, Illinois; Mr. Walter Kerr, Texas; Mr. Malcolm Lovell, Washington, D.C. Staff: George Walrodt, Virginia Solt, Ruth Tangman, June Konchnik, Diane Gelet, Clarence Douglas, Ralph Bregman, Jan Kary, Linda McKisson.

I would like to introduce to you our acting chairman, Dr. Duane Lund who will tell you about the Council activities to date.

Remarks--Dr. Duane Lund

I'll make this brief because the star of our show today is Dr. Marvin Feldman with a presentation that is significant and very important to all of vocational education. We would like to use this occasion to share with you what is happening in our national council. We have some reports, just approved yesterday for publication, entitled Sex Role Stereotyping. This is not just another report on sex role stereotyping. What we tried to do in a very small report is evaluate the evaluations or tie together a report on all of these studies. We were looking for programs that worked in sex role stereotyping problems and we have identified some of those programs and you'll find in the report names, addresses, and telephone numbers where you want to talk to somebody about a program that has worked. Another report on articulation--we certainly appreciate the help of the state councils--86 percent of the state councils provided serving information for our report on articulation and that was approved yesterday.

We now in a study on duplication as mandated by the Congress. It looks as though we are going to have to have some site visitations. We've found some reports from looking through the data provided by OE and the National Bureau of Educational Statistics--Bob Calbert's shop anyway--and looking through all of these materials we've found some indications of duplication, naturally, but to make sure they are and do a job on the report, we will have some site visitations.

Our highest priority, of course, in the last six months has been legislation. This afternoon you will hear a great deal about that from Roman Pucinski will be, of course, in charge of that presentation. Roman and Don McDowell over at this table here are, in a sense, consultants or guests at this occasion. They went off of our council but good rumor has it that they are both coming back on and we are just delighted with that kind of information. It's the kind of rumor we want to hear. And you'll hear much more about that this afternoon but we are very proud of the role the national council has had in legislation. And we've given testimony again and done an awful lot of work that is not visible to the public in terms of influencing legislation.

What comes out of Congress that you like we are responsible for. What you don't like, somebody else is to blame.

We accepted yesterday our School-to-Work report. We've had an indication in the last eighteen months that there will be an emphasis at the secondary level on placement. As more and more vocational education is into our secondary schools, into our high schools, there will be an expectation of placement as a responsibility of that high school. And so our school-to-work project into that area and we've had some success stories there and we had some failures there. There are other and similar projects now underway at a national level and some are state sponsored, too. But they don't have to rediscover the wheel because we have, I think, made some mistakes for them and we expect this will be helpful to them as they proceed with those

studies. We do have our latest report to talk to you about, that is our call for a national policy in vocational education and unless somebody comes up with a national policy after we have had the Bicentennial conference on vocational education we intend to answer our own call if nobody else will. It's high time we have a national policy so recognized on vocational education.

Tomorrow morning at 11:00 Dean and Larry from Minnesota and Gordon will be reporting to you on the national Bicentennial Conference. I think that has been the best venture that NACVE and SACVE has had together as a project. Our working relationship has been not only excellent but fun and we are all very excited about that national conference and we know that you will be too when you know all of the facts about that conference. I sincerely believe, and I know I speak for the national council and for those of the SACVEs who have been involved in the planning of this, that we sincerely believe that this is truly going to be a landmark event not just for vocational education but for education in America. We are very excited about it.

Well that, I think, pretty well summarizes what we've been about except to say that we really have been handicapped in that the White House, as you can see, has not made the new appointments. There are 21 council members, 7 go off and 7 come on each year. Seven went off in January and we still, in May, do not have their replacements or reappointments. So we are acting shorthanded, our staff was shorthanded of course, too, during much of this time until Ralph came aboard. And Reg, as you know, is our new executive

director. But I really can say with confidence that our council has functioned very well. It has not been a holding action. All projects and programs have gone forward. Thanks to the council members that have remained and thanks to a very effective staff.

I hope that you will have a chance to get acquainted with our staff. Reg had you meet them a few moments ago and I want you to know that as the acting chairman that I feel that this is truly the hardest working and most effective staff that we have had in the six years that I have been in the Council. Thank you very much.

Comment--Reg Petty

I think as far as the staff is concerned, if we are going to keep getting compliments like this, I think we may want to have three joint meetings a year.

Before I introduce Marv Feldman, I would like to say a couple of words about the job that Fred Hoke has done, and the job essentially done by the West Virginia Advisory Council in terms of doing the work and the preparations for this meeting. I would like to introduce, again, Mr. James McCartney, who has joined our council, at the head table, who is chairman of the West Virginia Advisory Council and, also Secretary of State for West Virginia.

Introduction of Marvin Feldman

Most of you are aware, I am sure, of the report, the article that was in the Harvard Review by Grubb and Lazerson concerning

career education. I use the word "career education" though most of the comments were very critical of vocational education. Our Council was concerned about this article, as you were, and we discussed at some length what the Council should do about it, if anything. A decision was made by the Council to urge Dr. Marvin Fellman to respond to that. He has done that and you are getting a firsthand statement as to what his response is; this has not been presented before. It is in the form of a paper that will be published. So what you will be hearing will be a paper not a speech. So, I would like to take this moment to bring on Marv, who most of you know, is president of the Fashion Institute of Technology, our oldest member of the Council, in terms of service.

Dr. Marvin Feldman (NACVE): Review of Career Education Article in Harvard Review by Grubb and Lazerson

Last fall, in now less a high-brow publication than the Harvard Educational Review, two professors, W. Norton Grubb of Berkeley and Martin Lazerson of the University of British Columbia, fired a thunderous broadside at career education and at vocational education. It was a shot heard around the educational world. While most vocational educators seethed and sputtered, of course the Washington Post and the New York Times applauded. The article was a widely quoted as any I can remember since I have been in education and I doubt for one minute that the response to that will be as widely quoted as the original article.

At the very time when work-related education was finally ascendant, in the public conscientious anyway, the article was cited as evidence that vocational emphasis in education was illicit and it was ineffective. Now I know that most of you have encountered the Grubb-Lazerson article, but I want to use it myself as a point of departure for a couple of personal assertions. The article was essentially wrong, but wrong in a very useful way. The authors, in the reaction to their work, exposed a couple of dangerous weaknesses in vocational education. These weaknesses are not the ones that Grubb and Lazerson meant to expose, or thought even that they were exposing. In fact, I expect that they are very puzzled by the uses to which their piece is being put. Grubb and Lazerson make a point which falls far outside the mainstream of the debate about the place that work-related education has in the larger scheme of American life. They are not upset about what happens in work-related education . . . what work-related education does or what is going on in work-related education. But they are upset about, what they say, it fails to do. They are principally troubled because career education and vocational education have failed to set right certain "crimes committed by the economic structure." In my paper, every time I say quote, I am quoting Grubb and Lazerson.

Now, for one thing, this is not the language of scholarship; it's really the language of soapbox. For another, the authors have trouble with the relationship between career education and vocational education, considering the former the successor to the

latter. But leaving these problems aside, the authors describe these "crimes" which career education fails to correct as follows. "Capitalism, as an economic system in which capital is central as part of the drive for profit, managers in an economic system like ours endlessly divide, simplify and eliminate jobs. This results in a constant status of underemployment for most workers."

Needless to say, this indictment of the market economy is not new. It wasn't very hard to find out where Grubb and Lazerson got it because Marx wrote in Das Capital, a century ago, "In manufacture, the enrichment of capital is dependent upon the impoverishment of workers" (Marx's quote). And in another place Marx wrote, "Manufacture transforms the worker into a cripple, a monster, by forcing him to develop some highly specialized dexterity at the cost of a world of productive impulses and faculties."

In short, Grubb and Lazerson assert that what our most commonly called Marxian social ideals are not best achieved by career or vocational education or even that work-related education interferes with the realization of these ideals. That, like religion, it is a kind of opiate of the working class. And in this assertion, of course, these authors are absolutely right. The concept of career education and the practice of vocational education have not, in fact, contributed to the overthrow of the capitalist economic order. This wasn't an oversight. This has never been, to my knowledge, our intention. The editors of the Harvard Educational Review put the matter much more succintly. They say, "Grubb and Lazerson conclude that the ills career education proposes to solve are intrinsic to our economic system." The point

is, of course, what we propose to solve is an entirely different ill. It's a dependency creating lack of skills to make a living. We don't believe people are enslaved when they learn skills. We believe they are enslaved when they have no skills. Nor do most of us believe that there is a tendency to cripple wage earners and this tendency is intrinsic to the economic system of America. We don't advocate work-related education as a way to correct this imaginary tendency and we should not site still when people say we don't do those things. A recent book by Samuel Boles and Herbert Gintis titled, Schooling in Capitalist America, broadened the indictment. "Since its inception," they write, "the public school has been seen as a method of disciplining children in the interest of producing a properly subordinate adult population." In short, schooling is designed to produce a docile work force for the capitalists.

It's true that both schools and work places have only slowly been freeing themselves from the ancient supposition that this hierarchical organization and repressive disciplines were the best way to get results from people. But, to call this coincidence, a conspiracy is really fanciful. It was a simple result of an error common to both schooling and business management. As Christopher Jencks, also from Harvard, points out, schools were repressive when wage labor was practically unknown and when most white citizens, anyway, were self-employed. Now where, it seems fair to ask, are these scholars, I should call them, Grubb and Lazerson's ideals really achieved? Where are they

looking for this great model? Where is the model? Well, we find the model in their paper in a footnote. In communist China, where work and school are logically integrated, they tell us. Where "the production of goods and food is meaningful." But in the United States, where goods are produced, "for the profit of a few," the integration presumably, is not logical at all. "A strong sense of community and purpose also serve to animate work among the Chinese people. "While in the United States," they go on to say, "almost all jobs are motivated by the external reward, primarily wages and secondarily, status and power."

Now, these authors seem to know much more about the Chinese experience than the rest of us. In my opinion, the carefully controlled evidence that has reached us so far doesn't support any kinds of generalizations. There is a much longer, somewhat more accessible Soviet experience, but it does not, on the whole, invite emulation by any of us into this system. This dialectical extravagance of Grubb and Lazerson is really out of place in a serious discussion of the goals and achievements of career and vocational education. The authors, of course, are absolutely entitled to believe what they want to believe. The market system is far from perfect. But the Marxian forecast now withstanding, there is simply no evidence that it has, in practice, offered progressively less satisfying work to fewer and fewer people. They say that you and I are involved in this conspiracy to see that that happens. Many educators, including vocational educators, see the need for enormous improvements in work places and they

are often amonst the severest critics of the inhuman use of human beings by organizations of all sorts. But, few would agree that there is some inherent, inexorable tendency towards such abuses under capitalism so that our only durable remedy is some systemic change in the economic order. And we are all bad citizens because we are not working toward those kinds of changes. The principal assertion of Grubb and Lazerson is not even arguable. Marxian social ideas are not, as they say, best achieved by career and vocational education, and we should publicly say so.

But many of the assertions the authors make in support of this major contention are uniformed, or wrong headed and both. It is very dangerous because they have contributed to the policy makers in the academic community a misunderstanding of the goals and practices of vocational education. This is what disturbs most of my colleagues on NACVE. Not the nonsense of the paper, but the uses to which that paper was being put. The authors imply, for example, that career education comprises a monolithic position which can be readily and rigidly characterized. The fact that career education has never spoken with a single voice is an absolute fact that everyone of us knows who work with career educators. Yet, Grubb and Lazerson not only assert that it does, but attribute to it an elaborate set of intentions and attitudes. You know, when these guys begin a sentence with, "Career educators believe . . ." it's already to mistake the character of this whole career education movement.

What are some of the attitudes these authors attribute to career educators? Here are a few quotes out of the paper.

"They have been agressive in refusing to define career education precisely." "They call for a dramatic reorientation of the entire educational system so that all phases of the curriculum would be absolutely job-oriented." "They stress that too many pupils unnecessarily go on to college." "They see retraining as distinctly subordinate to reform of elementary-secondary education." "They believe schools make work into an abstract concept." "They place great faith in the moral benefits of work." "They claim all work--all work--has equal dignity and meaning." "They assume jobs are both increasing in technical sophistication and requiring less education."

Some educators may share some of these beliefs. I even know a few who hold all of them. But, the authors present no evidence except a few quotations from a handful of sources to support their contention that "career educators" are as a whole rally around this elaborate rationale. Grubb and Lazerson assert, without evidence, that career educators have gone to great lengths to disassociate career education from traditional vocational education. Their purpose, apparently, is to set the stage for a synthetic conspiracy, not unlike the stage-managed rape in the Fantastics. I am not aware of anyone that has gone to any length at all to disassociate career from vocational education. Everyone I know acknowledges their unmistakable philosophical connectedness. We are treated to a fanciful interpretation of the origins of

vocational education. This one really got my hackles up. This is an absolute quote: "Part of a movement (It's a conspiracy out there) by the educational system to embrace the goals, structure and methods of corporate capitalism." This is simply silly. "Vocational education," they say, "has failed." They say it failed "in terms of income, status, job mobility, unemployment, job satisfaction." Vocationally trained students, they tell us, did no better and often worse than students in academic programs. This is demonstratably untrue. The article throughout is factually undernourished, the authors repeat thunderous generalizations without evidence. "Most work," they say, "flatly is boring." "The degradation of work," they assert, "has been continuous." This is not the American reality, not really. Our economic system, and it is really a non-system, has provided an ever expanding number of jobs, real wages have risen dramatically, 85 percent of the cash flow generated by business is paid in wages, hours are shorter, the four-day week, once a pipe dream, has become a reality for many workers, the three-day week for some. Work places are now safer, they are cleaner. Machinery has eliminated the most backbreaking, repetitive tasks and is continuing to do so. The humanization of work places is gathering a new momentum in America. There is a new book. It's called The Future of the Work Place and it catalogues this growing phenomena. This isn't to say that everything is really swell. Of course, it isn't. But the contention that American workers are being progressively and exorably degraded, exploited, and

dehumanized and we are part of the process, is not to be taken seriously. When Gallup asks people, "Is your work satisfying," 80 percent to 90 percent consistenly say yes. The famous Work in America Report that the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare in 1972 reported, that 80 percent of all American workers say they would keep on working even if they inherited money and didn't have to. But what is most remarkable about the article is the confusion it created in the ranks of both career and vocational educators. Many felt abused and defenseless. We are not guilty of the particular sins of which these particular authors accuse us. You want to know something? Many of use weren't too sure at first whether we were or we weren't. Whatever our legitimacy, whenver it is challenged, we get angry and disarmed. Whom the gods would destroy, first they make mad. The attack exposed a serious vulnerability. My friends, we have no systematic rationale. We have no solid sense of identity and purpose. We are not always sure what our sense of relationship ought to be with other aspects of education and if there is a national policy towards vocational education, I wish somebody would tell me what it is. Our rationale has too often been simplistic and superficial. We have been too interdirected. We have talked to ourselves. We have been sitting in the back of the bus so long, seething and grumbling, that we have become evangalists, too often depending more on emotion appeals than on reason and we are getting more comfortable doing that all the time. Some of us have complained--some of us who grew up in vocational education, anyway--have complained that for

years the world has seen us as subordinate, second to liberal education. I certainly have. Some kind of enjoy it. We wallow in the knowledge that we are misaligned and we are misunderstood. Sometimes I do. But, lately, I have been thinking that perhaps we have invited these demeaning characterizations because we, ourselves, have a very limited vision of vocational education. And I think we have misunderstood ourselves. Vocational education has a very soggy sense of identity and it is desparately in need of consciousness raising. We in vocational education need our liberation movement and the first step is to liberate ourselves from a limiting definition of what we are and what we can do. If a person thinks in his heart that he is second-rate, he is trapped by that definition as surely as if he were. We will be second-rate, we can't go beyond it and I see signs that vocational education is suffering from a serious identity crisis. Things that vocational educators have been saying for years, have become new universals; everybody is saying those things. We have a great and growing role to play in modern society but we may not be responding fully. We have accepted this submissive, subordinate role so long, we have grown comfortable in it. We have been riding in the back of the bus so long, we have grown comfortable there. Here and there, I see we have become the Uncle Toms of the educational establishment. The world has taken a different look at us; we must take a different view of ourselves. A wise man once pointed out that the specialist's most common error was to stretch the relevance of his specialty beyond its natural limits.

We have, I know, at NACVE, in our desperation for support and attention, too often implied that vocational education would solve all the problems of the world: from in-grown toenails to peace of soul. You turn Roman Pucinski loose and you'll find that vocational education is the answer to it all.

Vocational education has clearly outgrown its original rationale and achieved a new maturity. It needs a mature rationale to match. We have been proudly practical. We are very practical folks, forgetting that this practicality has its roots in Aristotle. Academic educators speak of liberal arts as if vocational education was, somehow, illiberal. If they're liberal, we are illiberal. Vocational education is liberating. It liberates from enslaving limitations, dependence on degrading toil. Many of the most stirring and permanent works of art are the works of anonymous craftsmen. Artisans extend the range of choice; they enlarge the human experience. We are told that the liberal arts liberate the artisan from the narrowness of his special skill. That is true. I'll buy that. But, it is also true that the liberal arts are lifeless without practical expression and that the practical arts are equally essential for the civilizing process. And, what is this nonsense between liberal and illiberal education in our public system. The Grubb-Lazerson article seems to underline another necessity. The need to cultivate a wider audience. We have traditionally spoken most exclusively to the consumers of vocational education. That will forever be our first favorite constituency. That is the source of our particular

strength. But we have clearly neglected other constituencies. We have because of a large sense of inferiority, neglected the academic community. Back in 1968, the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education mounted a public information campaign to change the attitudes of parents of students toward vocational education. That effort was a success. Vocational education isn't perceived anymore as a program for somebody else's kids. In my state, New York, half the students in secondary education in community colleges are enrolled in vocational education. Nationally, our enrollment now exceeds 13 million. The nation now spends over $3 billion a year for vocational education. We have achieved many of the goals we have dreamed about way back in the '50's. Vocational education is becoming the dominant mode of education in America. And, I remember of a dreamy conference when MDTA first came out in California where we said, gee, someday we may have 30 percent of those kids. Wouldn't that be nice. This new status brings problems and responsibilities of a very new and a very unfamiliar order. We need a new outreach to the nation's thought leaders. We need a new rationale solidly rooted in sound scholarship. We need a coherent national policy toward vocational education. The Bicentennial Conference in Minneapolis this fall that Duane talked about can, in fact, be a crucial first step toward these new imperatives. I hope its planners will give it maximum depth and that all of us in vocational education will give that conference full support.

And finally, I think we should, at least in private, thank God, for scholars like Grubb and Lazerson, who take vocational education seriously enough to critize it extensively. We can only profit from such attention.

Thank you very much.

Afternoon Session

May 6, 1976

CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING

ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Introduction -- Roman Pucinski, NACVE

First of all, let me state at the outset that I consider this perhaps the most important meeting of this conference. So, I am going to ask the Sargeant-at-Arms to lock the door and we are going to stay here, forget about that 5:00 business. We are going to stay here until we hammer out a program that is going to reflect your thinking; that is going to answer your questions; that will reflect your suggestions.

Now, we are very fortunate to have with us today what I consider the brightest, the most capable, the most understanding, people on the Hill. If their bosses heard me say this, they might be in trouble. But I think that I really speak for their bosses because our panelist today are among the most highly respected people on the Hill. And, they are here to tell you the changes that have occurred in the 1968 amendments. Jack Jennings has just come back from the Rules Committee where Carl Perkins has testified in asking for a rule on the vocational amendments of 1976 and it is my understanding that this bill will be coming to the floor for action, perhaps sometime next week. Jean Frohlicher will be able to tell you about the progress that has been made in the Senate. But it is already come out of the committee and will be scheduled for floor debate reasonably soon. She can probably

tell more about it. And, so this is your last chance as responsible policy makers in your respective states to tell us what you like and what you don't like about this bill. The problems that it may create for you. If there are any questions this it the time to ask them. I must tell you that a long time ago, I came to the conclusion that the most destructive of all human emotions is fear. People do not understand things, they are fearful, they imagine all sorts of things and perhaps are driven to all sorts of acts simply because they are fearful of the consequences.

Obviously, the country is changing. We are going to a $2 trillion economy very shortly. I have had to revise my figures. I have been saying all over this country that we are going to hit two trillion by 1980, but the most recent figures indicate that we will probably hit it somewhere toward the tail end of 1978, early part of 1979. There is a tremendous change in the whole technological program of America. Vocational education is becoming a very significant, integral part of this educational process and technological changes.

Marv Feldman told you at lunch time that there are now 13½ million young Americans engaged in vocational education. So, obviously, the 1976 amendments had to reflect the changes. This bill is being written to take care of the changing needs of America into the 1980's and many of the things that will be done under this new legislation will be done to affect the future of this country in the 21st century. Changes had to be made. As the principal sponsor of the 1968 amendments, I would have to say,

and I have said before the Congress, both before the Senate and the House, that the 1968 amendments have to be updated to reflect the changing needs of vocational education. So, I hope that there won't be anyone in this room who is going to oppose the changes incorporated in these two proposals merely because they are changes. As Jefferson said a long time ago that to fight change would be as if suggesting that a boy be required to wear the coat that he wore as a boy, as a man. So, obviously, these amendments in the Senate bill and the House Bill reflect the best judgment of our panelists today and the members of Congress for whom they work. Now, it is up to you in this session to raise whatever questions you have and don't be bashful. You are all here for one purpose: when you leave here we want no questions in your mind as to where we are going. The only question that will remain at the end of this session is how much of each bill will ultimately be accepted by the Congress and sent to the President. You know the legislative process: the House will hammer out its best version, the Senate will hammer out its best version; they will then meet in conference and in a spirit of compromise, they will hammer out a bill which they will take back to the House and Senate for final ratification and then send it on to the President.

So we have time and if there is something glaringly wrong with either one of these bills, this is the time to tell us. You all have your comparative prints in front of you. If you do not understand these comparative prints, this is the time to ask them. And,

Jack, Jean and Greg were nice enough to come here and spend this afternoon with us so that when you leav, you are going to be expert in this subject. Now, that's a big order. I hope that you will be patient. If some member gets up and asks a question, I hope you will extend to that member the courtesty of permitting that member to ask the question. You may not have any doubts about it. But he or she has the right to raise the question. I think that if we follow that procedure then we are going to have a very productive session. I know there are many things and many problems confronting you. I would like you to particularly pay attention to the changes being proposed in the House version as regard the state advisory councils and your role. There is no question in my mind that if this legislation is enacted, as I am sure it will be, that if block grants are enacted into law as proposed in the House version, you as state advisory councils, are going to have a vastly more significant responsibility because you and your fellow members on your state council are going to have to play a key role in deciding the priorities on how these funds are going to be spent in your respective states. You have heard me say many times serving on a state advisory council is no sport for the meek. It is a very responsible job. Now, in the House version they have tried to narrow down your future, your tenure, your responsibilities. One of the very significant changes in this bill is the fact that they now require state members of state advisory councils shall be appointed to three-year terms. In many parts of the country, you never know whether you are going to

be a member tomorrow. This has frustrated the independence of state advisory councils because you serve at the will of the appointing body. By having a fixed term, it is our hope that you are going to be able to take a more active role and a more independent role in deciding the needs, the vocational needs, of your respective state. We also deal here with the question of money. How that money is going to be directed. The whole thrust of the House bill is to give you more independence. Now the Senate has already spoken out on that issue in their report of 1972, I believe, wasn't it Jane? In which the Senate very clearly and emphatically stated that these state advisory councils were created to be an independent body of advisors on the vocational needs of that state. We will be talking more about that and if there are questions on that score, be sure to ask them here today. And so, I am pleased. I have seen that both the Senate staff and the House staff have done a great job. I find much to be commended in both these bills. I think that we are fortunate that we had on the staff of the two committees people who are basically very sympathetic to vocational education and people who have reflected that deep concern and understanding. It makes is so much easier, and I don't mind telling you, it has not always been that way in Congress. So, I hope that you are going to respect the fact that our panelists today are people who are deeply concerned with vocational education.

It also happens that we are also very lucky that in the House we had as chairman, Carl Perkins, "Mr. Vocational Education." He was the author of the '63 amendments. Carl Perkins has

tenaciously fought for vocational education because he has understood and understands today the full opportunities in this educational field. We are lucky that on the minority side of the House we had Al Quie who has been equally responsive to the need of vocational education. On the Senate side, we're fortunate to have Senator Beall who has shown a deep concern and a deep interest and a deep compassion for vocational education and the ranking minority member of the Senate, Senator Beall has reflected his concern and it is going to be discussed today, his own amendment. It shows the deep concern that he has. We are kind of lucky that we are going into this legislation with a group of people who are genuinely interested in helping the vocational educators of this country. And, I think that their work is reflected in this bill.

Let's call upon Jean Frohlicher and Greg Fusco who are on the Senate side and have done a fantastic job. I have know Jean for many, many years and I have admired the work that she has done and I know that she's going to be doing a great deal of work as this bill moves its way through the Senate and then in the conference. Now, this is your chance to ask whatever questions you have on the Senate bill. I'm pleased to introduce Ms. Frohlicher and Mr. Fusco in any order that you wish.

Gregory Fusco, Minority Counsel, Sub Committee on Education, U.S. Senate

I want to thank you for that very kind introduction on lauding the work of the staff. I'm not sure that you would say this, but

I'd like to go on record as saying that the only reason the staff works so hard is that there are members of the Congress, past and present, who are so inspirational as to make them that way. I think that point should be noted at the outset.

I'd like to talk very briefly because I want to maintain the most time for questions, about two things. One is the process of how the bill evolved and the second is the substance of the current Senate bill.

Let me talk about the process in which this bill evolved. As you know, in the Senate, this bill is part of an ominbus piece of education amendments which includes reauthorization of the National Institute of Education, the research arm of the federal government in education, and the Higher Education Act. So, the Senate, due primarily to its structure, of having one education subcommittee, does have this coming together at this point in times of one piece of legislation under a single bill number.

It has been my experience in dealing with this legislation, even though it has three parts which are of unequal size, that there has been more give-and-take, there has been more interface, there has been more discussion, there has been more participation, in arriving at the Senate Bill in vocational education. And, I think likewise the House, although I don't speak for those people, than characterize the Higher Education Amendment. I think that's notable. There is a process which I had the privilege of being associated with which involved meetings at both ends of the country and several states in between which has brought us

here today to the point where we have a House and a Senate bill at the final stages of their preparation, ready to go on their respective floors. I want to point that out as notable. When someone writes the history of the Education Amendments of 1976, I hope they focus on this process becuase I think it's a laudable one. And, it is your continued assistance as well as the ability of the staffs to call upon experts of various views that will give you a good piece of legislation.

Regarding the substance of the bill, I am going to leave the majority of time to Jean Frohlicher to talk about that. She is the expert person, more than myself. I want to talk about governance as being the key issue. We have never been able to move away from governance as the key issue and I think that is appropriate; that the disputes have gone back and forth; different views have been aired, but it remained the case, that the focus of interest maintained on the question of who shall govern the administration within a state of a federal program of grants to states. That is what we are talking about here, a federal program of grants to states regarding vocational education. I believe that the Senate has come to, in it's committee bill, a view which makes sense respecting the disparate nature of those fifty states and Jean will tell you more about that. My own boss, Senator Jacob Javits of New York voted with Beall on this particular matter throughout the consideration of vocational education. So, it is fair to say that Senator Javits and me, as his representative, are in support of the Bell position which is now in the Senate bill.

There are two other points which I will not ignore but simply mention as things that I think are very good ideas, in which Senator Javits was highly interested in. The Bill extends the bilingual vocational education authority with an improvement to that, and I think that's notable and important, but also creates a new part E for emergency aid for the facilities. I think this is something which Mr. Pucinski's testimony before our committee was very influential in convincing the committee of how necessary this was and I'd like to point that out particularly. It is not a large amount of money in the bill, but I think it is an important element. Beyond that I will be glad to remain as long as my schedule allows to help answer questions. The two people who will follow me are quite a good deal more expert than myself.

Roman Pucinski

I want to take the prerogative of introducing Jean Frohlicher because I believe I can honestly state that Jean is really the first lady of vocational education in this country. She has been very closely associated with the problem. I consider her one of the top authorities in this country on the subject and I feel, personally, very proud to have her here this afternoon.

Jean Frohlicher, Associate Counsel, Sub Committee on Education, U.S. Senate

The Senate has come, I think, quite a way from where we were when I talked to you last time, in large part because of input from members of this group and from other very concerned people about

the future of vocational education, The bill, as originally introduced by Senator Bell, hits the issue of governance, which as Greg said has been the issue, I think, that has gone throughout our hearings and throughout consideration of the bill. Hit the issue head-on. If we are going to have a sole state agency administering vocational education, should we not, from the federal level, assure that that sole agency is representative on the interest in the state, which are concerned with the provision of high quality vocational training? This provision got a lot of comment, a lot of very helpful discussion, a log of, as Greg mentioned, there are fifty states plus outlying areas, the District of Columbia, and one of the things that we have discovered in the two years that we have been working on this legislation is how many different ways states have seen fit to organize themselves, to run their vocational education programs as they see as the best way. The reorganization of the sole state agency would have meant tremendous amount of reorganization, tremendous change in state law. As a result, the Senate bill does not take this kind of a drastic step towards assuring that all interested parties within a state have an opportunity to participate. Instead, what the Senate bill as ordered reported by the committee on the 6th of April and, if my vocational skills of typing hold out, will be filed next week, we will have proposed to the Senate and to the consideration of the conference is instead the concept of a state planning commission to do two plans for vocational education in a state. The first would be a long-range comprehensive plan, a four-to-six

year plan which would assess the capabilities within a state for provision of vocational education through all kinds of institutions, facilities, the needs of the people of the state, students of all ages from secondary schools through adult retrainees, for vocational education and try to set some goals for the state itself to meet in providing the best possible vocational education over that four-to-six-year period. This plan would be a one-shot deal in that it would be, as I say, a long-range plan and would not be subject to the disapproval of the Commissioner of Education. It is the feeling of the committee that a state's plan should be, and its goals should be what it sets for itself and should not be subject to second guessing from Washington officials who would then be able to say, well no, you really should have said that your goal was X instead of Y.

Secondly, the planning commission would be responsible for an annual plan. In the Senate bill, the annual plan, the amount of papers that have to be submitted to Washington for approval is vastly cut down over the immense amounts of paper that right now must come in annually. It is a very simple plan which in essence describes how federal funds in the preceding year were spent, how they plan to spend the funds in the upcoming year, and how that measures against the long-range goals the state set for itself. It really speaks basically in terms of what do you plan to do, not what policy and procedures do you intend to do so that then you can do something else. A lot of the material that has to come in now about teacher credentialing, all sorts of boiler

plate, check off the box here or there kinds of requirements that are now required to be submitted are eliminated under the SEnate bill.

Now if a state already has a state board, which meets the configuration of the planning commission, it doesn't have to set up a planning commission, that state board can be the planning commission, that's no problem. If the state has all the agencies in the state that are listed in the legislation of the planning commission and they are all perfectly happy with the existing planning mechanism, they are all willing to certify that they've been given an opportunity to participate in planning, that satisfies the requirement. But the point is that when there were a lot of witnesses before the committee and the question came about post-secondary adult, secondary level education, there were basically two different kinds of proposals made to the committee. One was that the federal government should start carving up this money from the national level and should apportion 40 percent here and 40 percent there and set up another board somewhere else to carve up the remaining 20 percent. The committee decided that it didn't have this kind of expertise and the fifty states were all different. The needs of fifty states were all different. Therefore, where the important point came was in planning. And if all the interests in a state had an opportunity to be involved in planning, each state should find its own level in how it distributed its own money. Now, the state advisory committee becomes very important in this, because the state advisory committee role in this is

expanded from just simply advising the state board of vocational education on the administration of the funds. The state board still has full administrative responsibility, but the Senate bill also expands the role of the advisory committee to include advising the planning commissions in the development of the plan. And, one of the elements of the annual program plan, is an expansion on existing law which says that the checkoff for a state advisory committee action is not just that they have participated, but they have actively participated in development in all stages of the planning processes. I have heard from a number of state advisory committee people that they are handed an immense document 30 seconds before it has to go to Washington. This is not what is meant by state advisory committee participation. So, the committee bill is going to make it very clear that we mean for the advisory committee to be involved both in the planning process with the commission and in the administrative process with the state board. As far as the rest of the bill, I think we attempted very much to simplify the existing categorical provisions while basically retaining the various categories of support for research, for innovation, for student programs. Again, as I said, the hallmark is trying to simplify the thing, to cut down on the amount of paper work and to get the broadest representation of people out there who are concerned about vocational education actively involved in deciding what we do with our money.

Roman Pucinski

I imagine that every member of Congress has a secret dream way back here someplace of leaving some sort of a monument behind him after he leaves the Congress. I am no different; I have had that dream also. And, I must tell you that my monument has been fulfilled. I am so pleased that many years ago I was able to play a role in bringing a very, very talented young man to Washington. He is an attorney, who has served as chief counsel of my subcommittee when we were writing the '68 act and continues in the very important role today as Carl Perkins' closest advisor on the Vocational Amendment of 1976. Jack Jennings has earned the tremendous amount of respect around this country because of his deep understanding of vocational education and just as it was a privilege to introduce to you Jean Frohlicher, I am so pleased and proud that I can present Jack Jennings.

Jack Jennings, Counsel, Sub-Committee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, U.S. House of Representatives

Thank you very much. I appreciate those kind remarks. I appreciate Congressman Pucinski having given me the job in the first place. He took me out of law school when I was 24 years old and made me counsel to his subcommittee which is a very unusual thing to do with somebody that young. So, I appreciate the opportunity which he gave me.

I know that when we were looking at the Vocational Act the last two years, we looked especially at the testimony presented

by Congressman Pucinski and at the testimony presented by the advisory councils both the state and national advisory councils. And, I think that to a large degree the legislation which the House reported reflects the views and reflects the experiences of the different advisory councils. So, at least as far as we are concerned on the House side, and I knew that I speak for Congressman Perkins and I am sure that I speak for Congressman Quie, in this regard, that we have to thank you quite a bit for the advice you gave us, for the experiences you told us about in your testimony and in your reports, and I hope that you realize that the amendments we tried to fashion to a large extent recognize and are based upon those experiences. To be particular about it, I remember when we were drafting amendments, Congressman Perkins and Congressman Quie had Charlie Radcliffe and myself write some amendments. In the process, we were told to go back to the testimony of the advisory councils and check through on your recommendations to make sure that your different recommendations were reflected in the amendments. I think that you will find in Congressman Pucinski's testimony and also in the summaries of your own testimony that many of the things you talked about are in the amendments.

I would like to state, before I get into too much detail, that Charlie Radcliffe, who is the Republican counsel on our committee was not able to be here today. He is giving an address

Wisconsin and the time conflict was just too much for him. But, he did ask me to give you his regards. I would also like to thank you for changing the time of your meeting. I know that you were supposed to meet an hour earlier and I was wrapped up with Congressman Perkins in the Rules Committee and I appreciate very much your courtesy in changing your schedule. I also appreciate Jean and Greg changing their schedules to permit me to be here with you. I am also sorry that I wasn't able to appear at the state director's meeting this morning. I believe in vocational education, everybody ought to work together even though the advisory councils are independent and even though you have money earmarked by Congress for those purposes, you ought to work with the state directors hand-in-hand as much as you can. I, myself, try not to be favorites one way or another, and I'm sorry that I wasn't able, because of this Rules Committee action to be at the state director's meeting this morning.

But with all that having been said, I'd like to just give you a brief summary of what's in the House bills. Congressman Pucinski and George Walrodt have already made arrangements for us to provide you with copies of the committee reports tomorrow morning. If the Government Printing Office follows through, we should be able to give you enough copies tomorrow so that each state advisory council will have a copy and we should have enough copies for the members of national advisory councils.

What the House bill does is try to do this. It has three basic purposes. The first purpose is that the amount of funds

simply must be increased in vocational education. We have different charts and diagrams showing all the progress which has been made in vocational education. I don't think that there is anybody in this room or anybody in the country who can deny that a great deal of progress has been made in vocational education. The enrollment has gone up, the dollar investment has increased, the number of schools has increased. Everything points toward success. And, yet, the committee felt that the federal government clearly was not contributing enough to vocational education so the committee sought, through increasing the authorizations, to provide impetus for more funds for vocational education. But, there were two other purposes. Another purpose was to help to change vocational education so that it didn't reflect society's views in too many instances towards women and so that there could be change in vocational education so that there was less sex stereotyping and less sex bias existing in the program. I think that you will find that the committee feels very strongly about this. The committee conducted a separate hearing last year on sex bias and sex stereotyping in vocational education and they came to the view that vocational education, in too many regards, was reinforcing society's inferior status for women, and that the only way that women are to reach true equality in society is by looking for, by being trained for and by being placed in better jobs. And, we find in vocational education that that is not happening to a significant degree. You'll find if you look at enrollment charts in vocational

education, that you can pretty well identify men's courses and women's courses. Now, I don't think there is a feeling or a view that vocational educators are guilty of placing people in traditionally male courses or traditionally female courses. I don't think there is too much of a view that there is an outright bias, that there is active discrimination, even though we did have testimony that that too was in existence. I think it was mostly a feeling that society has to change it's view of women and has to change the role which women play in the job market and that vocational education, if anything, was pulling people back from that type of change and that vocational education ought to be in the forefront in bringing that type of change about.

The third purpose of the committee's amendments, and this is the one that I would like to dwell on a little bit, deals with changes in the administration of the program. The committee came to feel that possibly the present categories in the law were too rigid. And that possibly there was an obligation on the part of the committee to loosen up on the categories and give block grants to the states in order to allow a state to reflect through its own plan and its own particular needs. However, the committee felt at the same time that, and this is where your testimony came in to the most use,

felt that there was a lack of accountability, pure and simply, for expenditure of the funds and that there had to be a quid pro quo if the law was going to be loosened up so that a state could reflect, more accurately, its own needs. There was a need to tighten up on planning. There was a need to tighten up on accountability. There was a need to tighten up on evaluations. There was a need to tighten up on data collection and there was a need to strengthen the state advisory councils in order to achieve a better use of the funds. I think that you will find that the committee bill seeks to achieve these things by spelling out in unusual detail, what has to be included in the state plan and by requiring that local programs have to be evaluated on an individual program basis once every three years and that any programs which offer entry-level job skills, any programs which are offering courses which contend that people who leave those courses can go out into the job market and obtain a job, have to be evaluated during that three year period in terms of the placement of their graduates and in terms of their employers opinions of the skills of those graduates. Now I know that there are endless arguments about whether placement is an accurate indicator of success of vocational education. But the committee came to feel

that even though there may be other factors which show the success or failure of a particular program, these two factors, placement and employer's views, were the two most important factors and that they had to be shown on a sample basis for every program on a local level which contends that it's training people for jobs in vocational education.

Now, the committee has a whole series of amendments dealing with data collection. These amendments, too, are dual faceted. The first type of amendment seeks to overhaul the reporting system for vocational data and your advisory council reports are redundant in saying that year after year that you cannot tell, in many instances, how well a state is spending money because you can't find comparable data across the years or across the states or between courses. So, the committee requires that the data collection being taken out of the Bureau of Occupational Education and being put in the National Center for Education Statistics and this National Center develops a new data system for collecting information on vocational education. The second facet of the data problem is that we found, through our oversight hearings, that, in many instances states were not mounting programs which reflected the demand for jobs in a particular area within the state, or even within a region and that, in too many instances, once a program started on a local level it continued until it died of its own inertia or until students, for one reason or another, drifted away from the program, or until the teacher was laid off. I think the committee came to feel that even though

vocational education in all instances cannot be pegged exactly to occupational supply data, that there is a need to show how a particular program on a local level is trying to meet the demand for jobs within a locality. This, too, is another thing which was pointed out by your advisory councils and it's hoped by the committee that through all these amendments--the data collection amendment, the state planning amendment, the accountability amendment--that the advisory councils will have a better grasp on what is happening within the states so that you can perform your evaluation function much better.

I notice in reading the advisory councils reports, very often, you are like the National Advisory Council in that you talk in general terms within a state. It is very rare that, I have found through reviewing advisory council reports, that you really get down and say you have reviewed a local program or a series of local programs and that you are able to reach this or that conclusion on those local programs. Well, I believe that that was part of your function. The committee, through requiring these local evaluations by the state boards have to work with the advisory councils in choosing local programs which are going to be evaluated, deciding how they are to be evaluated and insuring the results from these evaluations on a local level so that you can reach better conclusions on a state level.

Now, as regards advisory councils, the committee has a whole series of amendments regarding advisory councils. I noticed that most of them are spelled out on the documents that you have.

There is a series of amendments seeking coordination or better coordination between manpower council and the state and national advisory councils. There is an amendment limiting the number of educators or educational administrators who can serve on advisory councils to a minority of any particular advisory council. There are amendments requiring that additional types of people should be represented on advisory councils. Local vocational education teachers, and guidance and counseling people, representatives of private schools, and women who have experience in job training programs. There is also an amendment which increases the minimum amount of funds which ought to be provided to advisory councils to $100,000 and increases the maximum to $300,000.

There is also a series of amendments dealing with the National Advisory Council and I have to be very frank with you and tell you that the Committee, in its report says that the National Advisory Council has developed into one of the outstanding advisory councils in the federal government. However, the committee believes and this is reflected in the report, that too often the National Advisory council has picked and chosen among its duties and that it has not carried out the function which it was to do under the original law. In particular, the committee points out that the duplication of post-secondary programs which an annual study which was supposed to be done by the National Advisory Council has only been done once within the last eight years. And, that the National Advisory Council is failing in trying to evaluate in particular respects, the performance of the

Office of Education on a daily basis or on a yearly basis in administering the program and that there was a need for the National Advisory Council to direct its attention to that function. There was also a feeling that the National Advisory Council has sought to gain too many grants from the federal government. Some of these, of course, have been imposed upon the Advisory Council by the Congress, but there was a feeling that the Advisory Council, itself, went out too often and sought money in grants and that this was diminishing from the function of the Advisory Council. The authority for the National Advisory Council to get those grants has accordingly been eliminated so that the National Advisory Council will no longer be able to seek grants from other sources. The Advisory Council can seek funds from other federal agencies but these funds are to be used for carrying out functions of the Advisory Council as specified in the law, and not any other functions.

Now, I know that the National Advisory Council has been a truly significant change body. It has blossomed into something which I doubt if even Mr. Pucinski, who is a prime author of the 1968 amendments, could have foreseen. It has been much more effective, I think, than the Congressional sponsors thought it would be in 1968. But in the process I think the National Advisory Council has sought to do a little bit too much, and has sought to do things in certain ways, which went beyond its original purpose. And, I think there is a recognition on the part of the Advisory Council now and a willingness to pull back to what its

functions were under the law. So with all that I'd just like to leave myself open for any questions. I just want to reiterate again and this is not political oratory and it's not trying to play up to your feelings or anything, but when we were charged with writing the amendments, when Congressman Perkins and Congressman Quie told the staff to write the amendments, we went back and checked, almost word for word, what the advisory councils submitted to Congress as your views and what you submitted in your testimony and what you submitted as part of your annual evaluation reports. The National Advisory Council was very helpful in that they summarized the evaluation reports and were able to insert that in the hearings. I think that you will find that if you study the amendments that hopefully, they do something. Sometimes you don't always know when you write things on paper whether they result in much. But, hopefully, these amendments mean something and if they do mean something, I think that advisory councils throughout the country have to be given a good deal of appreciation by the Congress for giving us your contribution.

Thank you.

Roman Pucinski

OK, now you have heard the opening statements. I hope you will have some good questions. I am sure that perhaps some of the members of the National Advisory Council would like to question Jack a little further on what he means by the fact that we

have spread our wings too far. But, I think we all know what he means and if there are any questions along that line.

Question

I really want to speak on three issues. One as a member of the National Advisory Council, one as a member of the New York State Advisory Council and the third as a practitioner in post-secondary.

The first one is to Jack in terms of the National Advisory Council. I believe that the statement of proceedings is well taken. We did spread it out of frustrations, out of lack of adequate funding. We take your criticism straight on in terms of evaluation and again point out as we did testimony without the resources, Jack. We had to seek funds in order to do those sorts of evaluations. I hope you will reconsider that in terms of that particular mission.

In terms of duplication, well taken. I am not trying to say this defensively, I want to reflect the frustrations of the National Advisory Council. The initial implications of duplication, that in itself, it was bad. And we had quite a time before we finally zeroed in on what we really mean by that. And, I know that you know that we are on it. I just hope that the Congress will consider the resources which we need in order to do essentially what we should do without hopping around Washington and seeking after funds.

Greg, I think I should now shift as a member of the New York State Advisory Council. We are very sensitive to the use of federal funds in terms of an over administration of vocational education and most of us know in some of the states it has been exploited. The whole business of a five percent, or a ten percent or whatever percent is set aside for necessary administration of vocational education. However, in the fiscal crisis that we are now in and will probably continue for a few years, is it too late to reconsider both the House and Senate version of the percentages that might be allowed out of federal funds for vocational administration? I know that in our testimony we thought they were ridiculous percentages.

We are quite right to compromise, Jean. It seems to me, that in our state to require 100 percent matching in terms of vocational administration at this time, Greg, and I know that I reflect this in other states as well, is sort of an undue hardship and I just wonder if we might consider some reasonable amount up to five percent or ten percent in terms of this figure. Because you will find that in the overwhelming number of states it is beyond that and in the fiscal hustle that I am in every day, it is kind of difficult not to put it in 100 percent match because in most states where the commitment isn't as deep as it is in our state, it might prove counterproductive and I just wonder when you go into committee if you might not consider, well, it shouldn't be 15 percent but it may be some percentage for vocational administration because I know it would be very difficult to layoffs and

budgets being cut. A final point, I know you people worked long and hard but those of us in post-secondary will have our day again.

Jack Jennings--Response

I'd like to make a couple of comments. One is that the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education has the highest budget of any national advisory council in education to my knowledge, except the one advisory council. And, so it is correct they need more money, but I think you have to be aware of the fact that Congress has given you more money through one device or another. This isn't counting your grants; it has given you more money than almost every other advisory council.

Now the second thing of duplication language, you are correct. It is sloppy. But, the National Advisory Council neve contacted Congress asking to rewrite it, never asked for an amplification of the meaning of that language, and didn't present any documents to us telling us they had done it or had not done it until about six years after the law was passed. So there is a problem there, too, with state-administrated money.

I want you to understand this very clearly and you have to understand that these bills are the bills of congressmen and senators. You are talking to staff all the time because our members are so busy. But don't ever get the view that the bill that comes out of the committee is the staff's bill; it is the congressman's bill, it's the senator's bill and it's the committee's bill. Now, I know that they rely on the staff to do a lot of work

for them. But, I know for sure in my committee that nothing comes out of that committee which isn't approved by the committee and approved by the chairman of that committee. I have been a little bit bothered by all this talk about staff. That is why I want to make it very clear to you where we stand. But the other point has to do with state administrators. This is not an issue which the staff tried to sneak through to gut state departments of education or anything. This was an issue which was brought out in the General Accounting Office Report. This was an issue which my committee discussed for about a week. We had all sorts of sessions--private sessions, public sessions, amendments this way and that way, discussing the state administrative money and the committee voted several times and they voted to require the states to match federal administrative money for vocational education. They did it for several reasons. One is that they were surprised at the extent to which state departments of education were retraining federal money in vocational education. Secondly, they were surprised that the Office of Edcuation has no idea how much the states were retaining and that when they sent out a survey to find out, they didn't define it precisely in the survey, so that when they got the results, they didn't even know from their own survey, how much each state was retaining for those purposes. And, there is a problem here with accountability. If these are federal monies and if they are not subject to state legislative action, they don't have to matched by any state money, they don't have to be reviewed by state legislature and if the Office of Education

does not know how these funds are being spent or how much is being spent for these purposes, there is something wrong. I think that my committee felt very strongly that these funds had to be fessed up to and that it had to be spelled out in the law exactly how much a state could retain for these purposes. I know that some of the more conservative state directors of vocational education sat in the audience during the mark-up of our bill and that they were feeding amendments to certain congressmen to have these provisions deleted and there were votes in committee and the amendments were defeated. The committee feels very strongly that there has to be a cap placed on state administrative money. Now, whether the cap comes too fast is another issue and I know that that is mostly what Marv was talking about. But, you have to know that in the House bill, it's a phase in over three years. The states can do whatever they want during the next fiscal year, fiscal 1977. In fiscal 1978, if they spend a dollar for administrative money, 75¢ of that dollar can come out of federal money, only a quarter has to come out of state money. In fiscal 1979, it has to be a 50-50 match: 50 percent federal money, 50 percent state money. If the state directors are going to have amendments offered from the floor, I would venture to guestt that they are going to be defeated very soundly by about four to one. This is one of the issues which I think the committee felt very strongly about.

Jean Frohlicher Response

I believe the Senate provisions are not beyond what can be done and they are quite similar to what Jack did in the House provisions. There is also a provision for what could be called--I may be coining a phrase--the supermatch, a provision which you now are matching. I think that these provisions do not represent an unatainable purpose, as well as giving all the vocational educators within their state legislatures a foil they may well need when it comes down to the very difficult decisions that leaders of general purpose government, state and local ones have to make. So, it is a two-edged sword. Whenever any of these provisions are monkeyed with, you may find yourself with the federal government giving you permission not to match, you may find both ends.

Just to be a little more specific on the Senate bill let me answer to Marv's question, I think first, you say is it a little too late to deal realistically. I think in that context, of let's find another percentage which is permissible. Give us the bill supported by both Houses, that the answer is yes. As Jack said OE didn't know what was being used for administration. GAO found in certain instances that a state which had been spending money for state administration for enactment zeroed out state budget items because suddenly federal money was available. So, it's not the states hadn't had commitment, it's that they found other dollars. State directors of vocational education finally made us an offer of 14%. The average has been between three and five. Well, we came in and did nothing. There was no solution

to what had been identified before the committee as a major issue. The Senate bill phases in a 50-50 match over, what I understand, can take a little longer period of time. 77 again is continuation of existing law with no limit because the entire new rewrite of the Senate bill did not take the effect until '78. We don't give them one year at the Office of Education to get some regulations written so people know what the rules of the ball game are. It is between 1978 and '80 there is a three-year phase in before you have to hit fifty-fifty.

Finally, what Greg calls supermatch is one other way of avoiding having a match of existing dollars for state administration and the occurs only in a state which is overmatching its supply of vocational funds in twice the national average which brings you up to about ten to one in dollars. And, it was the belief of the committee that state is indicating that kind of commitment of its own monies to vocational education in that it is not only overmatching the 50-50 ratio but it is twice the national average overmatched. But, in that situation it does not make sense to require them to engage in bookkeeping operations of moving money between program and state administration in order to meet the categorical match. But that would be an annual determination by the Commissioner and he has the authority of that situation to set the federal matching requirement at something other than 50-50. It is within his discretion to set it.

Question

One question that has perhaps, bothered state advisory councils more than anything else and has been most vexing in many states, has been the question of money. And how money is to be spent. Perhaps Jack would like to comment on the language that is now in this bill: the new language which reads, "the expenditure of those funds" first of all, points that no state advisory council can get more than three hundred thousand dollars and less than $100,000. So the expenditure of these funds is to be determined solely by the state advisory council for carrying out its functions under this title and may not be diverted or reprogrammed for any other purpose by any state board or agency. Each council shall designated an appropriate state agency to act as its fiscal agent for purposes of disbursement, accounting and auditing. Each council shall designate, now in some states that hasn't been quite true. Perhaps there may be some questions on this new language and perhaps Jack or Jean might like to address themselves to it. Are there any questions on this particular subject.

Is the ESEA act going to provide the same 50-50 matching or are we going to be in a desparate situation in vocational education because it does not?

Jack Jennings Response

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I provides that a state can reserve up to one percent of its state Title I

money for state administration. One percent. State directors of vocational education, as Jean said, said that they needed 14 percent of the federal vocational education money to be able to do what they are doing. Fourteen percent of the federal money in vocational education, in their view, would have to be used for state administration.

Question

I don't think that many states would disagree that is too high, but I would like to see a level of percentage of federal money to be used rather than this 50-50 approach. That is what is going to kill us at the state level because state governments imply don't set up positions.

Jack Jennings Response

The committee considered an amendment which would have set a cap of five percent and the state directors said that they couldn't live with that. So, Congressman Quie offered an amendment which said that if you believe in state's rights, if you believe in state's responsibilities and he is a good republican, he said that you should have states matching federal money for administration.

Question

Well the questions that I am trying to raise is whether or not putting a level on there would not handicap the states that

are economical and let the ones that are uneconomically operating their administration make the sacrifice rather than clear across the country.

Jack Jennings Response

How do you make a determination like that? The Office of Education doesn't even know what is spent today on administration much less what is spent economically and what isn't spent economically.

Question

Thank you for a very good presentation and my apologies for not having read the entire bill, but from the summary I don't see anything in there about the vocational student organizations that are an integral part of the instructional program and I believe that the National Advisory Council came up with some suggestions some months ago that it might be included in that. Is there any thought to include in the bill anything about the vocational student organizations?

Before Jack answers that question, I might at this time point out that Don McDowell, who is the leading spokesman on this subject in the National Advisory Council, had suggested some language here that may or may not be acceptable. But I just thought you ought to see it. He is hopeful that this language can be included as a floor amendment. Congress recognizes the

contributions of vocational student organizations and encourages their inclusion in vocational curriculum programs. Now we are not even sure that we can get this in, but we felt that we couldn't go any further than this very limited language. Perhaps, Jack and Jean might want to tell you why.

Jack Jennings Reponse

Well, believing that honesty is the best policy in all these things, I will tell you straight out. I think there are two concerns as I was telling Mr. Javits before the meeting. I think there are two concerns about amendments to include vocational student organizations in federal funding. The first concern was that the student organizations have shown a great deal of growth. They have shown a great deal of contribution to improving students perceptions of themselves and of the program. They have definitely been an asset. I don't think there has been any doubt about that.

Precisely the federal vocational money is to be used for instruction, to be used for classroom instruction providing job skills. It is not to be used for things which are not directly related to that purpose, except in isolated instances where you have particular rules applying such as with state matching and state administrative money. So I think there was that concern.

The second concern was that when the national organizations were asked, they said, "Well, we don't want it for national organizations, we want it for classroom instruction." When they were asked to spell out details--what did that mean?--they came back with a list of things saying: teaching people parliamentary procedures, teaching them organizational structure. Now, what does that have to do with vocational education? That has to do with youth organizations, which are existing out of fees, which are trying to instill a better self-concept in people--that doesn't have to do directly with providing classroom instruction for jobs. I think there was the feeling that if something was put in there which could be interpreted in any way to permit building up of structures on a local, a state, or a national level, that it would divert from the purposes of the act which was to provide job training.

Now I know that the Office of Education, under its present regulation, says that federal funds can be used for youth or-

ganizations if it's directly tied in with instruction. However, they have an example in their legal opinion which contradicts itself. It says that you can directly tie into instruction if it's a job fair, which is somewhere under the operation of a youth organization, but that you have to show how that's related to instruction. I have to admit that I don't remember the exact wording, but they did have an example in there dealing with job fairs which was contradictory.

So I think there's a concern that any type of language opening a door like that may be detrimental and may be detrimental to the youth organizations, because it's always easiest to rely on federal funding or some funding like that which comes on an annual basis as something you don't have to work for. If these organizations are pledged to self-industry, self-independence, maybe they should exist out of their own dues, maybe they shouldn't be brought into federal regulations, federal rules, Title IX regulations dealing with sex discrimination, the whole gamut of things that come along with federal aid.

Question: I wasn't asking about funding. I was asking about giving them a little of the due that they should have. I'm mentioning them as an integral part of the instructional program. May I calmly suggest that the next time perhaps if you ask the students the question of how these things are an integral part of the instructional program, I think you might have gotten an answer that would have really been very, very good, because sometimes, especially if you're asking an academic person about what in the world is VICA, or if you say DECA, they say,

"Well, it's a record company." The kids know. We've had a hard enough time to even get this girl into our state plans. We're not asking for dollars, and this is certainly something new. We're asking for it to be recognized--for any student organization that is an integral part, whether it's vocational or other, that is an integral part of the instructional program.

Jack Jennings response: I don't think there's any problem with recognizing them as worthy contributors to education. But I think you're contradicting yourself when you say that you just want to give them recognition and by putting them in the state plan, but you don't want money. The state plan deals with expenditures of federal money.

Question: Let the state plan deal with that, but at least put it there to let the people out there in the field know that they are part of the instructional program. Am I making any sense here? Apparently I'm not.

Jack Jennings response: I don't get the gist from it. If Mr. McDowell here, who is a very persistent advocate of this point of view, is able to work out some language--he wants to talk later --which would recognize that thing, I don't think there would be much of a problem with that. I think it comes down to whether they're going to get dollars or not.

Roman Pucinski: That's right, and Don has already made it very clear that any language that we suggest to the Congress regarding youth organizations will very explicitly exclude any requests for money, dollars, anything like that. That's not the ideas. Next question.

Question: I have a question dealing with a definition. I'm referring to the materials we have before us here put out by the National Advisory Council. On page 3, for example, in section 8 of the House version--and I know it's occurred in other sections of the bill--the use of the word "trade"--and I'm wondering whether or not anyone spoke to the definition of "trading," whether or not that word got some preference over instruction or instructing or educating, etc. Another question related to that is the use--in that same section--of the redefinition of vocational education, which is broader, obviously, than the earlier definition. I appreciate this current proposed definition, and whether or not it does have likelihood of existing in the ultimate bill.

Jack Jennings response: I should have pointed out in my remarks before that there's two mistakes on page 3--one of them has to do with the definition of vocational education, so you may have to take your praise back, and that is that the definition was not broadened to include baccalaureate programs--that's an outright mistake. It is less than baccalaureate degree training. The second mistake is that with the State Advisory Councils up in that other paragraph--it's not any group or any individual on the State Advisory Council who can appeal to the commissioner over a state plan, it's a State Advisory Council itself which is given the right to appeal. So that means that a minority on a State Advisory Council is not given the right of appeal; it has to be a State Advisory Council adopting a position as an entity. But in regards to your first quesion with training,

training is defined in the act as meaning classroom instruction and instruction in vocational education in other settings. There isn't an attempt to say that training means instruction or instruction means training.

Question: I want to raise the question then why we can't use language that is more appropriate, because when I see the word "training," I refer it to, "You train animals, but you educate people." It seems to me we open ourselves to some criticism of vocationalizing education with the use of that kind of term.

Roman Pucinski: I might point out on this point, though, that the fact that you will now have at least determinate three-year terms and this appellate procedure where the State Advisory Council now can go to the Commissioner of Education if they feel that the Council's suggestions and proposals have been ignored or the Council was not sufficiently consulted on the development of the state plan. You have this appellate procedure. My own feeling is that it's goint to make the State Councils a good deal more effective. I don't know whether you agree, but I think you're going to find that that will give you a little more muscle to do the work that you're supposed to be doing.

Question: On page 1 of the materials passed out by the Advisory Councils, section 2, it states that it's not to exceed 1% of the basic grants transferred to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for vocational educational programs. What's some of the thinking and projections of how that's to be handled and how it's to be used?

Jack Jennings response: That provision says that not more than 1% can be transferred for Indian programs. This doesn't state it exactly. What is says is that based on the percentage of Indians who are aged 15-24 in Portland, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has direct responsibility. Based on that percentage as it is of the total percentage of such people in that age group throughout the country that money is available for Indian education programs. Now all that wording comes down to one-third of 1% of the vocational funds would be available for Indian education programs. Those programs would be available in these two aspects. The Commissioner would have to contract directly with any Indian tribe which is now being contracted with by the Department of the Interior under the Johnson-O'Malley Act or under the Indian Self-Determination Act, the Commissioner of Education would have to contract with a tribal organization of any such tribe to provide vocational education programs, if that tribal organization requested that contract. And this goes in conformity with the Indian Self-Determination Act which gives Indian tribes the right to directly administer federal programs. Any money remaining after those contracts have been made is transferred to the Bureau of Indian Affairs to operate vocational programs in the Bureau's own schools. Now the Bureau of Indian Affairs up to about 1954 used to have about a 50-50 split between academic programs and vocational. Then they adopted a policy which is the general policy throughout the country of going away from vocational education towards academic education. This Amendment would require them to go back a little more toward vocational education.

Roman Pucinski: May I remind you that we are working with two bills. That Senate bill is just as important as the House bill, because at this moment in time I don't think anyone in this room, including our distinguished guests, can tell you or us which of these are going to prevail in the final conference. So if you have any questions on the Senate bill this is the time to ask them.

Question: Mine is one the House bill--I have two questions. The first deals with the provision for a study by NIE of vocational education, I just was concerned about the Congress moving to NIE from a group similar, say, to the Essex Commission. The second one has to do with the situation with regards to the Amendment on Home Economics and what we have there. Is there any possibility of floor amendments and what has the Rules Committee said today on the amendments, etc.?

Jack Jennings response: With the first question, the study by NIE, I think was a feeling on the committee's part that there was a need to go to an agency which could be somewhat objective and to evaluate the program and to conduct a long-term evaluation. I think this is part of a general trend which is developing in Congress to rely upon the NIE for long-term policies, i.e., the Congress, and I'm sure Mr. Pucinski can tell you this, has often had to react from crisis to crisis, and because of limitations on staffing and budgeting and all, has not been able to develop a long-term perspective towards these programs. I think there was a feeling to develop

the capacity of the NIE to do this type of study. The Congress required them in 1974 Education Amendments to conduct a five-year study of the Title I Compensatory Education Program and to submit this study to Congress in 1978 so that when Congress is renewing the legislation they'll have a series of studies available to them with recommendations for renewing the legislation. So I think this is a second instance where they want a long-term study to be available when renewal time comes to look at the program. As regards to the Home Economics Amendment, the Committee adopted that Amendment and I know from Mr. Pucinski and from a number of other people the home economists in some parts of the country aren't too happy with it, and that there's some concern about it, is to understate it, I guess. I don't know whether there's going to be a floor amendment or not. There was discussion today among the members of how someone might offer a floor amendment to strike that language and to go back to the original language in the law. I don't know, though, who it would be or whether anybody is going to do it or not, but that is the one section of the bill which has been identified as being subject to possible amendment. To our knowledge, no other part of the bill is going to be amended.

Roman Pucinski: Our own position on that House provision is a strong fear that by spreading this home economics and home making and consumer program as broadly as they have that you're going to start adversely affecting home economic teachers. After all, there's just so much dollars in that program and if you're going to spread yourself out into doing these non-teaching

activities by people other than the home ec. teachers that that would adversely affect the home economics teacher community. There is a very valid fear on that part. We feel that many of the things that have been suggested in this broadened definition of home making study are now being done or can be done under the Model Cities program, Action, there are other programs that are now on the books. We would prefer to keep home ec. in the classroom and directed toward some of the things that have been spelled out here. So I'm sure that there's going to be some strong effort to change that House amendment. There was some action taken the other day by the home economics teachers who met in Kansas City, and they spoke out very strongly against this language. My judgment is that we'll hear more about this. The Senate leaves the language pretty much as it is.

I might also say in reference to the question that was asked about the NIE study, having been duly admonished by Congress and by council for Congress, the NACVE recognizes that between now and 1982 NACVE is going to be doing a great deal more of these types of studies. There's a strong feeling within the members of NACVE that since Congress created NACVE for that purpose perhaps NACVE should be charged with that responsibility, although we're going to be making studies like that as part of our ongoing responsibility. So the Senate has no similar provision, so there will probably be some further discussion on that particular provision and I'm not sure what's going to happen in conference.

Question: I know that the State Advisory Councils are very concerned about the independence that they might have. In the new proposed law from the 68 Amendments indicates a little more flexibility for them to operate within their states. I would like for you to comment as to whether you feel that this flexibility that's in the new law gives the State Advisory Councils the autonomy that the intention of the law indicates and will it be possible for these state advisory councils to operate under the legislation that is necessary for them to do the job that the law sets for them to do?

Jack Jennings response: If you're asking whether the Amendments contained in the House bill which emphasize very strongly the law of the independence of the State Advisory Councils, whether those amendments reflect the original intention of the legislation, I think you would find that the answer is yes. But I think the oversight of the program we conducted for two years, including our own testimony and including testimony of people in individual states showed that it came down to a matter of having to put something in the law to spell out very precisely and very clearly what the independence of the Advisory Councils entailed.

Question: I think that if we are to fulfill the mandate that the legislation has indicated to the State Advisory Councils--and I speak for my own state--I think we are certainly going to make sure that the law indicates exactly what the legislation indicates for us to do, because there is a lot of pressure out here in these states for State Advisory Councils, whether we like to admit it or not. Unless the law indicates

that they do it according to the way that the legislation is written, it's not going to get done. I have one question that was handed to me I'd like to ask: Will the Advisory Council use school administrative districts as fiscal agents?

Question: The answer is no under the House bill...the Advisory Councils under the House bill use local school districts as fiscal agents. This was discussed. The House bill says that State Advisory Councils have to use state agencies for their funds. The State Advisory Councils have the opportunity to designate any of the state agencies they want to for the holding of their federal funds to act as their fiscal agent, but this would not permit advisory councils to use private universities, it would not permit advisory councils to use local school districts. I'll tell you that this amendment came in and we found that, unbeknown to the committee--and this was ignorance on our part--a number of the advisory councils were using the local school districts or were using private universities as their fiscal agents. I think there was a feeling on my committee's part, at least, that private universities ought not to be used, that they ought not to be funnels for federal money for advisory councils. I think there was also a feeling that local school districts ought not to be used, that the federal funds ought to go through a state agency if the federal law did spell out precisely the independence of the advisory councils in the use of their funds. Now I know that 11 advisory councils are either using local school districts, area vocational schools, or private universities. There

may have been a need to do that if your control over your own funds was not spelled out in the law. I don't think there is a need to do that anymore, if the law does say--as the House bill says, I think--that you do have control over your funds. I don't think there's a need to go to anybody else besides a state agency. Now if there's disagreement on that I think it ought to be spelled out and I think people ought to put down on paper why they can't operate that way. Also, I don't think the Congressmen I work for will buy the idea of a private university handling federal money like that. They may buy the idea of a public agency, like a local school district, handling money--maybe. But I think you would have to answer their question: if your independence is reasserted in the law, why do you need to shop around like that? why can't you have the state treasurer or the state controller handle the money?

Question: . . . . a state agency does not allow some of our ideas to operate in the way that . . . we would like to operate under the legislation of the law. I hope, and I'm sure that my colleagues from South Carolina will agree with me, that you put it into the law as straight down the line and without all the big words that Southern folks can't understand. Make it real sure that everybody can understand what the legislation means.

Roman Pucinski: Let me interrupt you there and read you this language again, because we're right here in perhaps the most important part of this discussion. This is what the language in the House bill is, the proposed language:

> The expenditures of these funds is to be determined solely by the State Advisory Council for carrying out its functions under this Title and may not be diverted or reprogrammed for any other purpose by any state board or agency. Each Council shall designate an appropriate state agency to act as its fiscal agent for purposes of dispursement, accounting, and auditing.

It would seem to me that if you picked the state treasurer and he gives you a hard time or doesn't do what this law provides or tries in some way to interfere with your total and absolute independence, by the very simple expedient of action by your state council you can fire him as your fiscal and find some other agency in government. I think that this language goes a long, long way to clearing up the problem that you're raising here before the Council today. Do you agree with that?

Question: We don't have that problem in South Carolina.

Jack Jennings response: Let me just give an open invitation. There's another amendment in here, too, page 113, which says that state advisory councils are authorized to obtain the services of people and are authorized to contact for such services to carry out their evaluation functions independent of programmatic and administrative control by other state boards or agencies. This is another amendment trying to say in the law that advisory councils are independent. Now if this is not enough I hope that people will give me a call or write and let us know or work through Mr. Pucinski on the National Advisory Council. I think the intention is clear to make you independent. I think there's concern that federal money go through proper channels, too.

Roman Pucinski: Just so you understand, because again I say this is important, let me just very quickly read this one paragraph that Jack was talking about. This is the way the language now reads in the proposed House version:

> State advisory councils are authorized to obtain the services of such professional, technical, and clerical personnel as may be necessary to enable them to carry out their functions under this Title, and to contract for such services as may be necessary to enable them to carry out their evaluation functions independent of programmatic and administrative control by other state boards or agencies.

In other words, the Governor or no one else can tell you whether or not if you decide you want to hold a conference of school superintendents to discuss vocational education and you want to pay their transportation and that's your judgment as a state council, you can do that and nobody can come along and say you can't do it. Now as long as what you're doing is legal nobody can superimpose their judgment on the judgment of this advisory council. So the language "independent of programmatic and administrative control by other state boards or agencies" now clears up the thing that has been so vexing to so many state councils in not knowing just precisely who has control over you. Under this language, really nobody.

Question: It's just a coincidence that that's the question that I was going to raise and someone must have stuck it in Tucker's pocket. I'll raise one further question: Could this stipulation of naming your own fiscal agent in the state be in conflict with any state constitutions in any way?

Jack Jennings Response: I don't see how it could be because these are solely federal funds; these are not funds which are being mixed with state funds. I know that we have that problem

sometimes in federal programs when they try to involve or require the participation of children in private schools, and what they always do in those situations is say that in that particular type of program the federal money must be 100% so that no state constitutional barriers stand in the way of that type of participation. I think it would be analogous to this situation. If it's 100% federal money, I think that federal rules would apply, it would not be state constitutional rules.

Question: I raised the question because I have in my hand a letter from the Attorney General, State of Michigan, that states, in effect, in his opinion the State Board of Education or State Board would be the fiscal agent for these funds. In my hand also is a letter from Commissioner Bell, and that one I think must have wrritten because I think I can go either way on it and it won't make any difference. The point I'm making is they've explained to us that they're addressing themselves to the same question under the Planning commission and now we're doing the same thing. I know there are other agents in the state we could use but they're saying specifically the State Board of Education or the State Board. That's why I raised the question.

Jack Jennings Response: If that interpretation is possible under the present law, in my opinion at least, I don't think it would be possible under the House bill. I could be wrong. One think I've learned as a lawyer when you work with language, you can't always put down what you intend. Maybe the intention isn't fully carried out. If there's some better way to

do it, and if you can consult with somebody, maybe you could bring this new language to the Attorney General and ask him whether the same ruling would apply to that new language.

Question: That was my next question. This does differ from the former language?

Jack Jennings Response: Without a doubt. All of the language which Mr. Pucinski read is new language.

Roman Pucinski: Now one question I might ask Jean: There's nothing in the Senate versions on this new language. But since the Senate has already previously spoken out so clearly on the independence of SACVEs, would you think that in conference this language could survive? Would there be any strong opposition in the Senate that Jack has been talking about?

Jean Frohlicher Response: I know of no opposition to specific language. You're perfectly right, the Senate has been on record consistently in favor of the independence of advisory committees. The committee report, although the bill language is not substantially altered, again reiterates the Senate's intention that advisory councils have independent status from other pressures within the state. So I would think that we would be sympathetic. I've learned never to call how a conference is going to come out, but I know of no pressures on our side that would go against the concept of strongly independent state councils.

Roman Pucinski: Would you agree, though, with Jack's statement that if this language were adopted the questions raised by the Attorney General of Michigan or the letter would not apply?

That once this additional language establishing clearly the rights of the State Advisory Councils under this position of their funds, Jack seems to think that if this language is adopted, it could not be challenged by the State Attorney General. What is your thinking on that?

Jean Frohlicher Response: I would, at first glance, go along with Jack on that. I think that one of the basic rules of legislative construction is the Congress does not enact intuitively, and therefore assuming something like this became enacted the General Council of HEW and, I think, the State Attorney General would also seek to read some new meaning into the additional language adopted by the Congress. That is the obvious first interpretation of what that new language means.

Question: I'm one of those states (Connecticut) that has that statutory problem, although I like to think we're very adequate in our accounting procedures and we can really get it out. The use of an appropriate state agency brings another question to mind that I don't we have discussed here, and that is administrative footdragging. I have seen, being a fiscal guy myself, how you can tie up an entire agency by just simply forgetting to sign the checks, and know the procedural matters required within our own state fiscal auditing procedures, my question is: (1) Does this exempt SACVE from complying with state fiscal procedures, in other words, with the state statutes which appear on the books? The paths that one must take within the state in order to be allocated once the money is received from the federal government is a very serious path, as it is

in many states, I'm sure. My question is, does this exempt the state council from going through those procedures?

Jack Jennings Response: My answer is going to be a little vague. I don't think it does, but I'd have to know a little more about those procedures. I think these amendments try to speak to the uses of the funds and to control the uses of the funds. Now if the question is whether the day after the state controller receives the check from the federal government to the state advisory council you can walk into the state controller's office and say, "Give me the money," I don't think that this language would mean that. I think it comes down to a reasonable situation where you can't tell states to disregard all their own statutes. But I think that what the language is trying to speak to is saying that the advisory council gets to choose, regardless of state law or regardless of opinions of administrators of states, the uses of the funds. Now I know there is administrative footdragging, I can understand that, too. The advisory councils have come a long way in the last couple of years, but the advisory councils are to be advisory--they're not to be put always in an antagonistic situation, too. And I somewhat wonder, I think the advisory councils have a long way to go to be fully effective in evaluating programs and in giving advice, and we hope some of these amendments will assist the advisory councils in doing that. But you're not to pull apart from the programs so they can stand over on the side and issue press releases every week, either. You are to work with the state directors of vocational education in improving the

program. You are not a P.R. machine out on the side, which harps about the administration of the program and doesn't do anything else. I just say that to be blunt with you. I've told the state directors that you're independent to their faces and I've told them that I didn't think they were giving you enough independence, but I'll tell you, too, don't get so enamored with independence that you forget your function, which is to help the states in running the programs better. Maybe there is some administrative footdragging, maybe there's some need for doing something, but I think you'd have to document it pretty clearly before the committee would change this amendment.

Question: I wasn't thinking of the P.R. concept, Jack. I was thinking more of the concept that if, at times, we don't happen to agree with what the state board of education is doing, then perhaps, as I said, you get into the administrative footdragging procedure.

Jack Jennings Response: But the money doesn't have to go to the state board of education. Why can't you designate the state treasurer?

Roman Pucinski: Let me just throw in one further question. The question is (from Pennsylvania): Would any appropriate public agency eligible to receive federal funds be designated as a fiscal agent?

Jack Jennings Response: Not under the House bill.

Roman Pucinski: Not under the House bill, and the Senate bill is silent on that, right? 152

Jean Frohlicher Response: The Senate bill is silent . . . I think we have to distinguish between the situation where a state advisory committee is actively being pressured in what it has set for itself to do because of bureaucratic pressures, and this is intended to say, "No, it's independent." It's another thing, I think, to say you have to submit a travel voucher or you have to submit the proper kinds of paper to travel here or to hold a meeting there. I don't think it's the role of the federal government to say, "No, all state rules on how one handles money and on the kinds of paper one submits to get it are out the window." I think that what we're trying to do here and what OE will have to do about regulations later is attempt to give you some cutting edge between those two things. If there's active interference in what the advisory committee thinks it should be doing then you're not purely independent.

Question: We're one of those states that went to that private university as our fiscal agent because of using the types of monies that we use. We found it much more efficient in establishing. . . .

Roman Pucinski: Perhaps we can get a further clarification, and maybe, since this is really the heart of the problem--he/she who controls the pursestrings controls everything--perhaps, maybe in view of this discussion here and the problems that a number of SACVEs are having, perhaps both councils might want to give it some further thought. I think that the House version goes a long, long way toward giving our SACVEs the kind of independence that both the House and the Senate have been talking about for a long, long time. But as long as the

placement of funds (I would have thought that since the SACVEs can designate the fiscal agent if that fiscal agent is not doing the job--if they're footdraging, if they're giving you all sorts of problems--I would think that the most simple way to get around it is to just fire them and pick somebody else. Now maybe that can't be done. Maybe those of you at the operational level know something about this problem and perhaps this is the time to tell Jack and Jean about it.)

Question: We have a very good, and have had a very good, working relationship with the Division of Vocational Education. They were very helpful to us in terms of having us establish a separate and independent fiscal agent, in this particular case it was the Office of Budget and Management. This was done with the "approval" of the state Attorney General's office. A new administrative law was passed in Vermont that controls how funds could be spent. It has nothing to do with the Board or some other agency telling us what we can do, except for this one, which allows only a certain number of people out of the state at a certain given time, and other footdragging kinds of things. When this happened, the state Attorney General's office informed the Office of Budget and Management that we would be included under this new law as long as we stayed with the Office of Budget and Management. So the Office of Records of the Office of Budget and Management urged us to find an agent outside the state government. We're doing it at his suggestion. And it's working. But this amendment is going to change that. It's going to bring us back under it. . . .

Roman Pucinski: Why is that?

Questioner: Because it restricts the number of people who can travel out of the state.

Roman Pucinski: But under this amendment the language that Jack had talked about earlier, the language as far as you're concerned is that you're independent of programmatic or administrative control by other state boards or agencies. If you decide to send 6 people to this conference that's a decision that you make.

Questioner: We're not independent of state law.

Jack Jennings Response: We're trying to distinguish between different types of state law. On the uses of money I think there would be agreement that you would be independent on travel and the uses of these funds under this amendment. I think you would be under present law, but other people disagree. Now I don't think you're independent in the sense of certain types of procedures being followed and issuing money, like a state law requiring that a voucher be filed if you use money or some paperwork or something. No, it's very hard to give you a precise answer because it depends on the state law and it depends on what's happening.

Let me make this suggestion--this could go on for quite awhile. As long as the House bill is giving you trouble, since the Senate bill is silent on this, the thing you should do is this. You all are going to have the House bill tomorrow morning, hopefully. So take that language back home and run it by the state Attorney General or run it by somebody to see what it does

in your particular state. If it does create a problem even with this new language asserting your independence or reasserting your independence, then put it down on paper and get it to somebody--get it to Jean or me or Mr. Pucinski or George Walrodt or Reg Petty, or whoever.

Roman Pucinski: Or your own Congressman or Senator. But can I just make this footnote to this discussion? What sometimes appears as footdragging is nothing more than plain old bureaucracy. There are members on the National Advisory Council who have got huge sums of money tied up that we have expended for various expenses and travel and whatnot and we're waiting 5 and 6 months for OE to reimburse us. There are many contractors in this country that just don't want to do business with the federal government because it takes so darn long to get your money. And they go out of business. I don't know how many small companies Uncle Sam has driven into chapter 11 and bankruptcy simple because the bureaucracy has held up their money that is legally theirs. So don't always blame this on some sort of a conspiracy against you. It may be just nothing more than incompetency.

Questioner: That's just one of the reasons we split with them, just to avoid that bureaucracy so that we could process things much faster, and we could get the type of accounting reports we want which we are not able to do under the state.

Roman Pucinski: It's getting late and I think we've made our point. Are there any other urgent questions you want to ask of these two very brilliant young people?

Questioner: I just want to make one statement about this fiscal agency. Minnesota is now trying to change the antagonistic types of things that has existed between the advisory council and the state department were eliminated after they came to a fiscal agency. The state department fully supported them getting out of that.

Jack Jennings Response: Let me just say that I don't feel the House is frozen in ice. If you can look at this language, document your problems, and come back to Mr. Quie or to your own Congressman or whoever, I think there would be a chance for you--it if creates a problem.

Question: We in Ohio have been enjoying that degree of independence in fiscal agencies that you're attempting to get. I'm just not sure, after your talking here, whether we're legal. We have as our fiscal agent a state supported technical college serving as our fiscal agency. It works out very well. Under your language, does that cause a problem?

Jack Jennings Response: I think under the current law you probably are legal because the Office of Education has regulations permitting you to do that--that's my understanding, at least. Under this amendment you would not be legal.

Roman Pucinski: One quick question that has spent a great deal of time yesterday was on the state agency, the state planning board in the Senate bill and the Bell substitute. I was wondering whether Jean might want to address herself to this and give us some of her thinking on this.

Jean Frohlicher Response: I start by saying that it is not called the committee bill because what was discussed as the Beall substitute

between the subcommittee and the full committee was bogged down by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the bill was unanimously reported to the Senate. It is being co-sponsored by all members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, except one--Senator Laxalt. Although I think that there was a great deal of discussion about the planning commission, about whether or not state advisory committees given a planning commission were created within a state whether or not the state advisory committee should be made permissive rather than mandatory. The committee decided rather to continue to require the existence of state advisory committees in all states. The planning commission language of the committee bill now will go into effect only in those instances in which the state agencies within the state concerned with vocational education do not feel that under the current mechanisms established by the state for planning adequately allow them to participate in the decisions. It doesn't say that they have to win, it doesn't say that they have to have total control over decisions, just that they have an opportunity to participate. In that interpretation to the Commissioner of Education then allows the state boards to continue to use whatever current mechanisms he's got to involve everybody in planning that is involved in the state.

I would like in closing, and as was suggested to me after the meeting of the state directors this morning, we discussed planning a good deal and I pointed out that a recent study by Project Baseline indicates that only two state advisory councils

are actively involved in planning right now--from the beginning through the development of the state plan. The state directors took a vote and they voted that everybody in all the states, at least most of the show of hands said this, said their advisory committees were actively involved all the way through, and they felt that they had a signficant impact on development and input into the state plan. In order to be fair about that, I'd like a vote this afternoon. How many of you feel you really get involved in the state planning process?

Roman Pucinski: How many feel they're not? Now, Jean, do I understand what you're saying is that under the Senate version, the state planning commission is discretionary, not mandatory? Now the NACVE took a formal position that we're opposed to a state planning commission that would have spelled out these specific members, but if it's the case of an elected school board there's no way you can do that. So this is discretionary?

Jean Frohlicher Response: No. The state planning commission would be mandatory if the state did not have some alternate way of involving those state agencies. It's only in those states where agencies do not get currently involved in the plan.

Roman Pucinski: Now the Beall substitute would give these planning responsibilities to the State Advisory Council.

Jean Frohlicher Response: I have not seen the language of the Beall substitute that is what we discussed in the committee. What we discussed in committee was making the advisory council responsible for planning rather than the planning commission iteself, and this was rejected by the committee. Whether or not there are plans to alter the language on the floor, I do not know at this time.

Roman Pucinski: In view of the fact that the state planning commission survived by only an 8 to 7 vote, is it reasonably possible that this state plan requirement may be dropped in the final process?

Jean Frohlicher Response: I think in the process of going to conference . . . the House bill is a totally different mechanism. The House bill also addresses the issue of planning as one of the key issues in improving vocational education. I think that both bills can differ in seeking to improve the state planning mechanism. I think that a conference bill will come out with something that reflects the concept of planning whether or not a commission or whether or not the process picks the House bill.

Question: The activities outlined are good. Washington likes the House bill. I guess my question is are there dollars attached to carry out all those functions? The question to both of you is how do you arrive at your minimum?

Jean Frohlicher Response: The Senate bill doesn't . . . in money.

Jack Jennings Response: The House bill tried to figure out to a certain extent how much money it would take to do new functions also in addition to what you're already doing. The House bill requires that State Advisory Councils be involved earlier in the planning, it requires that State Advisory Councils be involved in these triannual local evaluations. So there was an attempt to cost (evaluate). I'll be very honest with you, though--it's very difficult to do. You're trying to compare

Vermont with New York, or Idaho with California. How do you come up with a dollar amount that makes sense in a state that has one-tenth of the nation's population and a state that has one-fiftieth of the nation's population? To a certain extent you have to be arbitrary and you just have to set a certain amount of money and hope that it works out. If anybody has any better advice on lower amounts, I'm sure that our committee will be happy to go along.

Question: Our concern was with the Senate bill where you're talking about a minimum to be extended another 5 years with no consideration for rises in costs, inflation, etc. Our Council is a minimum budget council, and we with our carry-over get $67,000 per annum and this past year we expected to spend $70,000. I wouldn't say that we've shaken any earth in spending that money. We've got minimums. Now you're asking for additional functions in the House bill with at least a $100, 000 minimum, but the Senate bill stays at exactly $50,000 and expects to do the same thing over the next 5-year period with a cost factor that's bound to rise. That was my question: why they didn't raise that minimum?

Roman Pucinski: I think that what Jack has suggested earlier is if you're going to have these committee reports more for the House bill, we will try to get you the Senate report. NACVE staff will try to get copies of the Senate report and we'll get them to you as quickly as we can. As Jack and Jean have both suggested, please read these reports, look at how this stuff affects your respective states. That's why we

have SACVEs. It's the first time in the history of the country that we have a network in all 50 states and territories that can plug into a flow of input to help write the kind of legislation that is going to be meaningful. So we ask you, please read these reports, let your executive director digest them for you, let him see how this will affect you because it's pretty hard for these people to write a bill in Washington that will meet all the problems of the 50 states and territories. Get that stuff to Jack. I think that you have seen here today and known this before that both Jean and Jack who are the principle forces in their respective committees--Jack is right, Congressmen and Senators write this legislation, but they're the people who do the technical work, and Jack and Jean are reasonable people, and if there is some sort of a problem that is going to cause a real problem to you, get it to them as fast as you can. Remember, you've got a time factor. You've got a time factor of Tuesday or Wednesday going to the House floor--they're going to be on the House floor with this bill Tuesday. So on your way home tomorrow read the report. If there is something really urgent in this thing, get word to Jack. Send him an air mail special letter. We had a very successful meeting here, simply because we had this worksheet to work with. I'd like to pay tribute here today to a very really capable employee of the National Advisory Council--George Walrodt who has done an extraordinary job in working with both Jack and Jean, who has put together this excellent form, and I'm so pleased that Jack could find only two mistakes

in it. George, that tells you really what a fine report you've put together. I'd like you to give George Wallrodt a hand. Also, I really want to thank both Jack and Jean for being with us . . . .

REMARKS BY RUDY GIRANDOLA,

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NEW JERSEY SACVE

They say this country started with 13 states so maybe we can do it with whatever is left here today.

I think there are two important things that we should be concerned about in what we heard yesterday. That is the Planning Commission and also, the fact that a fiscal agent can only be located in a state agency. Those two things, I believe, will do the most for closing down Advisory Council activities within two years. Maybe that is a bold prediction but I really am concerned about it. Certainly Utah's problems are not New Jersey's problems. Minnesota, California, all the rest of you, perhaps, are working very nicely with state agencies and state treasurers, but I think in the long run, potentially, that this kind of thing presents a problem to the independent operation of your council. We have examples of it, we are going to document it and we feel it is a very, very grave concern. And I have put together a kind of a resolution, a double-barreled resolution which I hope those of you who are attending will put forward as a motion and we can get an expression from you regarding it. It says this: "Be it resolved that the state councils oppose any provision in the Act which may serve, or potentially serve, as a hindrance to carrying out their mandates in an independent

manner and be it further resolved that state councils are opposed to any provision in the Act which would eliminate the option of locating their funds in those legitimate agencies empowered and legally constituted to disperse federal funds."

I believe it is a very, very important resolution. Perhaps, it comes a little bit too late, but I urge you to take some action on it.

It was moved and seconded that the resolution be accepted. Resolution passed.

It was further resolved "that the state councils are opposed to any provision in the Act which would eliminate the option of locating their funds in those legitimate agencies empowered and legally constituted to dispersed federal funds." The motion was seconded and the resolution passed.

Morning Session
May 7, 1976

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION: FEATURING THE PUBLIC INFORMATION PROJECT

Speaker 1: . . . On behalf of the California Council I would like to present a certificate of commendation to the National Advisory Council for their assistance in helping us develop our public information project. We really appreciated this and we would also like to express our appreciation to Woody Woodhall who really put this thing on for us. And so with that I'd like to give this certificate of commendation to the chairman of the National Council.

Chairman: Thank you very much, Bob. We do appreciate it. We're very proud of the program--it's one of the first that was started by the Council, and Martha took good care of it. She said, "You've come a long way, baby." Paul Tschetter also would like to make an announcement at this time; Paul, from Colorado. Paul is chairman of the Colorado Council.

Tschetter: On behalf of the Colorado delegation, I'd like to note for the assembly an event that to us is extremely important. On July 1 of this year our regional state director, Irwin McKay, is going to retire. What the Colorado Council has done is to . . . the efforts and work of Mr. McKay and we want to recognize his having served us that faithfully by making this statement to this assembly. And so, Irwin, I would ask that you just stand up and we would like to give you a round of applause.

Chairman: I just want to add from the National Council our congratulations on a job very well done, Irwin. You're

one of the first persons I met in this business, and I think you'll still stick around even though you're retired.

Speaker 2: . . . It's probably one of our oldest programs--it goes back to 1968. You may recall our first report where we addressed the issue of vocational education as being good and fine for other people's kids. The response to that report led us to the conclusion that if we were in fact to implement the hopes of the '68 Amendments to the '63 Act we really had to mount some kind of a public information program that really described the new look at vocational education. We found Woody Woodhall buried out there in New Jersey, we brought him to Washington, and began a couple of experimental programs on quick single concept films, public information films, 3 seconds, 2 minutes, 3 minutes, we kept trying to find a vehicle of getting the whole new look of vo-ed out there.

In our follow-up studies, some interesting data began to come back to us. For example, in 1971, we did a study of Woody's films in Florida. We discovered, much to our surprise, the major response was from women. The women in Florida were concerned about careers, opportunities in vocational education.

The second check that we made of the films was in New Jersey. We discovered that the overwhelming response--and they were in the thousands and thousands--to Woody's spots came from adults--24, 25, 26--particularly Vietnam veterans. Is it too late for me? Can I learn a skill? Can I re-enter? They turned out to be the major constituency in New Jersey.

This then quickly led us to turn Woody loose with governors.

We had about 15 or 16 governors making these spot announcements, particularly to returning veterans. Of course, that led into a whole series of activities of Woody's spots.

May I introduce Woody Woodhall, the project director of the National Advisory Council's communication program.

Woodhall: Thank you, Marvin.

This morning, rather than have Woody Woodhall give the presentation, I'd like to turn the meeting over to some key people whom I have been working with in four states. At this time I'd like to introduce them to you. They're executive directors and associate executive directors. On my immediate right is Linda Phillips from California, Don Brennan from Idaho, Paula Carter from Indiana, and, sitting in a very strategic position between his chairman and wife, is Jack Higbee from Utah. Each of these people will have a short presentation to share some ideas, some of the things that they have been doing in their states.

I'd just like to say a few words before I turn the program over to these people. This year Mr. Eddie Blizzard, who is a high school student, member of the F.F.A., won the national award for the speech contest at the F.F.A. convention in Kansas City. His speech was entitled, "Not Just a Farmer." In that speech he told a story about a young child who was on the third floor of a burning building and as the flames grew higher, the child was quite fearful and ran to the window screaming for help. A fireman raised the ladder and started up after her. The wind shifted and the hot flames came over to the ladder and the fireman almost

fell off the ladder and tumbled to his death. As he hung on that ladder, thousands of people were looking at that burning building and the child and the fireman, and they were stunned, and their hearts quaked at the thought that this young child may perish in the fire. All of a sudden someone yelled out, "Give him a cheer." And cheer after cheer went up and that fireman heard the cheer, regrouped his courage, went up that ladder, and brought the child to safety.

In a sense, this story typifies a lot of things that are happening in vocational education. There are a lot of children in burning buildings. I think of the tremendous divorce rate in our country today. I just read an article in a Denver paper coming here. More and more divorces--one of three now. And the woman is really taking the real hardship, financial hardship, because not only is she left with the children, she's left with a small amount of money. There's a tremendous opportunity for vocational education here to get that women into a skill so she can earn a decent living.

We take a look at our Vietnam veterans in the past asking us if it's too late for them to learn a skill. There are so many opportunities in America for people with skill training. Many times our films and our surveys and our persistence on the part of the executive directors and public information specialists throughout the country to give people alternatives in life. One alternative is vocational education. Our new thrust now is --if you want to lead the lifestyle you choose, you need a good job. And in order to get a good job, you have to have a skill,

because thousands of jobs are going begging. That skill training is vocational education. It's a viable alternative.

When we look at our films and we put these films on across the country, it is a cheer for vocational education, it does provide alternatives for people, and we are producing what we're advertising.

What I would like to do now, while we have the lights off, I'd like to open up our presentation with two television spots in California, and then rewind it, set the projector again and run a spot from Idaho and a few spots from Utah. I'd like to do that now, ladies and gentlemen, then we'll have our presentation from our speakers.

(FILMS) . . .

I'd like to now introduce the Executive Director of the Utah Advisory Council on Vo-Ed, Mr. Jack Higbee.

Higbee: We had a great time producing these films. The one that made it possible, primarily, is Woody. You've been a great person to work, a lot of effort and a lot of time, but he came by I can't say how many times.

We decided to work with the motion picture department of Brigham Young University in Provo to produce the films. We contracted with them for $9,000. We spent a lot of time with them. They really became turned on. The idea was to turn on the producer. He became so turned on that, as a matter of fact, he actually lost his job as a result of the films. The contract price was $9,000 and they spent about $18,000 doing them and he was over budget and he was terminated and he is

now working in Salt Lake in the Fine Arts Dept. for the Bi-Centennial thing.

But they became so interested they wanted us to go the traditional route, rather we did more or less, and they said no, don't do it. They actually videotaped this movie theater spot, then we took another spot from another state. We went out into high school classrooms and showed the two films to the young kids and then got their reactions to them. Then they computerized the results, we went down and had about a three-hour meeting and debate and finally decided to go with the movie theater spot. They had to convince us to do it, as a matter of fact.

The attempt is, as Woody has emphasized, to individualize the film for the individual state. Utah is 72% Mormon, and by having the third spot you saw President Kimball, who was the prophet then for the Mormons in Utah, give a strong endorsement of vocational education will have a major impact for vocational education in our state. We don't think it will turn off the non-Mormons--they may just turn it off and not look at it, but we don't think it's offensive to them--but it does mean something to the Mormons and we think it will have an impact on the Mormon mother when she helps make the decision as her boy or girl goes on to prepare for their life's work.

Of course, the endorsement from the governor is a good thing.

Utah is very family oriented. One of the major problems is that--and it's kind of a church problem, too--the parents

have a major impact as far as helping their kids make their decisions. Mothers are saying they want their daughters to go to Brigham Young University. When you say that you're going to go to college you're talking about either the University of Utah or BYU. I think Utah's number 1 in the nation as far as high school graduates who go on to college.

Anyway, we've got to break that thing down. We felt that this film on the parents--that we called the parent spot--where they say that the future of your children is in your hands, and perhaps their hands gets that problem. The attempt has been to individualize them. And we think we've done this with these films.

We had to raise the $9,000. The State Board agreed to put up $4,000, and then we tried to raise the balance from industry. We got about $2,000 in, and the response was really quite slow. I finally sent a letter to 30 companies and asked them if they would participate with 29 other companies and give $100 each. As a matter of fact, 22 of the 30 companies responded with the $100. We thought that was a pretty good response from the letter that went out. We did raise the $9,000 from either the state board or from private companies.

In our film--the movie theater film--we mentioned that thousands of jobs were going begging. We showed this in our Council meeting and the number one manpower expert in the state was there and he said that's nonsense. He said there are not 50 jobs in Utah going begging. We took that as a challenge too, and we sent out a survey, a questionnaire, to

1,000 employers, we got responses from 301 of them, and one of the questions was, "During the past 12 months specifically, how many jobs went unfilled in your company due to the non-availability of a qualified person? List the job and how many." This was a response from 48 of the 55 largest firms in Utah, and the number of employees employed by the firms who responsed was 120,000, which is 27% of the total employees in our state, which we think is a pretty good sample. They listed 87 different kinds of jobs as going unfilled in their companies--only 2 professional jobs on the list. They listed machinists, L.P.N.s, diesel mechanics, auto mechanics, secretaries, stenographers. The only two professional jobs listed were industrial engineer and geologist.

The jobs totalled up 831. If these 301 firms have 831 jobs we think we can say with accuracy that thousands of jobs are going begging in our state, inspite of the highest unemployment rate in 20 years. This was kind of a follow-up to the films.

It's not all gravy. The problem now is getting the films played. It's a constant struggle to get the films played. It's almost a 25-30% time assignment to keep them on the air. We have three TV stations in Utah, and Channel 5 KSL did play the films as a corporate effort during February. They played the 60-second Good Life spot 58 times, they played the 30-second spot 30 times, and they figure they gave us $9,000-worth of free time in February at $100 a spot. Channel 4 has been a real problem to us. The President Kimball spot was played 8 times during April by Channel 5. Channel 2 has been

quite cooperative. It is a problem. When I go back in the nect week we'll be working with the Chamber of Commerce with their Board of Directors showing the films and talking to them about how they can help us get them played. The General Manager of Channel 4 is on that board, and this may be the breakthrough with him.

One thing we've done that's a little bit unique is that we've gone to Granite School District, they videotaped the films, and they have enough videotapes now that they have a tape for every junior high school and every high school and they'll be played in every junior high school and every high school classroom during the next month, primarily during May. We picked then the 60-second Good Life, the movie theater spot, and the Governor Hampton spot. Salt Lake City School District has videotaped them and taken them to West High School in Salt Lake. During the morning announcements when the principal comes on and so forth and they have a monitor in every classroom, they play then the 60-second Good Life, the Governor Hampton spot, and the movie theater spot. We think this is helpful, too, in getting into the classroom with the videotape approach.

It's been a great venture and it's been fun working on it. We're glad we've gone this far that we can now get them played. When Woody told me that we'd get $50,000 worth of free time if we'd invest the $8 or 9,000, based on the response so far, there's no question that this can come to pass if we stay on the ball and keep them going. Again, let me commend

Woody for the help he's given us. He's played a major role in this whole thing.

Woodhall (NACVE Staff): Thanks, Jack. I'd like to present Linda Phillips from California.

Phillips: I have to agree with Jack. This has been really tremendous experience. It seems like the Councils get into so many heavy, serious projects. This was an opportunity to do something light and uplifting and has really been a fun experience for everybody involved. I really would like to thank Woody and the National Council for their help.

Despite the fun and the lightness, of course, it has been a lot of work. Those of you that are considering doing it, I would put a lot of time into the planning phase. California learned some things the hard way. You'll notice we had an English version and a Spanish version. We didn't think about this when we made the films in the first place. It was kind of an afterthought that we did the translations. If you do have some bilingual populations in your state, you should think about this in the planning phase, because it can save you a lot of time.

Something that might be an idea that we're thinking about in the future, instead of doing everything verbal we're thinking of using the subtitle idea to take care of perhaps some of the deaf population. This would be another possibility.

One of the things that we put a lot of time into was our packaging of the project. We wanted to show you an example of these. We have both radio spots and television spots. We made kind of a little folder with a pocket in it for the radio

spot or for the films. Kind of a showy thing, really, is about what it is. Inside the folder, we've included a copy of the script and a certificate of commendation, and a personalized letter to the manager of the station telling the person what it was about, etc.

Something else that we learned the hard way, and I don't the other states have this problem but we're catching up to them, is that we didn't have a local tag at the end of our spots. Most TV stations--and I think radio stations as well--donate most of their free public broadcasting time to local projects, local informational things. What they wanted us to do at the tale end of our films was put the name of someone to contact. Once again, after the fact, we had to come up with an idea. What we did was add a 35mm slide that said: contact your local vocational education director. It would be much easier if you put that right on the end of the film.

In short, I just want to summarize by saying that I urge all of you to do this, to talk to all of us, to take a long time on your planning phase, and to include a lot of personal contacts. We hired an EPDA fellow to work with our Council to make personal phone calls, personal visits to the television people, the radio people--it's quite a fulltime job. Thank you very much.

Woodhall: Thank you, Linda. You also didn't tell the people that California is really two states. I found out that there's a Los Angeles area and a San Francisco area. It's quite different. Don Brennan from Idaho.

Brennan: Again, we owe a lot of thanks to Woody and what he did in Idaho. I think, actually, the public information project was the most progressive project that's been done in vocational education to promote vocational education in a long time in our state. In fact, we had, I feel, and may still have, an image problem on vocational education. I think that's what the National Council was talking about in 1968. We had that problem, we still have somewhat of that problem. But it's changing, and I think this public information program is helping to make the change.

In Idaho we did six spots. We did three one-minute and three 30-second spots. Right now, we've got the one-minute spots on our television stations--we have seven in Idaho. Consequently, they've been played for the last six months. Interestingly enough, and I don't think even Woody knows this, there's one particular station in Boise that plays them automatically almost at the same time everyday. In fact, one spot comes on at 5:30 during the Mickey Mouse Club, and actually this has been on now for the last three weeks exactly at that time. If you're in Idaho and want to see one of our spots, you can watch that. I don't know what that means, Woody.

The first three spots are minute spots that are on now, and we plan to go back to the television stations as soon as they stop playing these, and after six months I thought maybe they'd stop a long time ago, but once they do we plan to go back with the three 30-second spots as a follow-up.

I might mention some of the things that we got into in

Idaho in our fund raising. We went out and contacted business and industry to raise the funds. We felt that this was one of the best aspects of the project because in going out to business and industry we found out their feelings about vocational education--both good and bad. Consequently, we were able to communicate this feeling back to the Division of Vocational Education. I mentioned this to my Advisory Council and some of the things that we fed back to the Division were really not too pleasant, other things were communication problems, and I think it's really helped the Division to realize what business and industry felt about vocational education in Idaho.

We raised $11,000 from business and industry in Idaho, and we contacted 45 businesses and industries in Idaho. One of the contributions, I remember I got over the phone from a small Ford dealer in Louistown for $50; another donation we received was $1500 from one of our larger manufacturing firms in Idaho. So what I'm saying is donations will vary. The $50 donation meant as much to us as the $1500 donation.

We are going to follow our commercials up with a concept film on vocational education. What I mean by a concept film is a film that will go into more detail on individual programs going on in vocational education across the state. This will be shown to young people interested in vocational education--people in the 7th grade and all the way up--and consequently can be shown to PTA groups, can be shown by directors to people that want to find out what's going on in vocational education in Idaho. I think our second media project is just as important

as our first.

I might mention also in our commercials--and maybe you noticed that--we did do a spot on the handicapped, and you'll notice the communication with the hand language. I've never told Woody this before but I've been interested to know what exactly they're saying in the use of that language. I can't tell and the only thing we haven't had anything come back to the state indicating there was anything said that wasn't exactly right. I want to say that this has been a very successful project in our state. And consequently if your state hasn't gotten involved in this, I might say it might be good to do it.

I might also say that this is the first time in Idaho that vocational education has been fully funded. We had a--and this has been an annual thing--we meet during the legislative session with legislative leaders--now I'm talking about the Advisory Council. Consequently, we had 10 at this last year's meeting. During the legislature we showed them our commercials, and then just privately I wanted to find out how many of those legislators had actually seen the commercials prior to our showing them in the meeting. And I talked to practically all the 10 before the session was over and 9 out of the 10 had seen these commercials on television. So you never know what kind of a response you're going to get. Not only have we gotten feedback from people interested after seeing the commercials, interested in programs, writing to what we call our title, "Success," Division of Vocation, Vocational Education, Boise, Idaho--not only have we gotten feedback from these people in-

terested but we've gotten feedback from parents and other people who say that now we understand a little more about the program and it does sound like vocational education is a first class program. Thank you.

Woodhall: Thank you, Don. You know, there's a new breed of vocational educator--these executive directors. I always thought Harlan Geese was a real bulldog once he got an idea he wouldn't stop till it was done. And Brennan is just like he is. We'd go to these different businesses and industries, put the bite on them for money, and tell them they had an investment in this thing just as well as we did, and we're in Louiston and he got on the phone, he says I've got this guy--I should call him, he runs a Ford dealership. Well, he got on the phone, called, he's talking, I said who are you talking to? He said, well he's not here but his wife is. He got $50 out of his wife!

Paula Carter from Indiana.

Carter: As you all know, Indiana is number 1--we're number 1 in basketball and we were number 1 in public information programs. Indiana was the first state to participate in the public information program way back in 1969-1970 with the production of television spots. In addition, we have developed quite a comprehensive program of public information in addition to the television spots. We also just recently received state statutory status, and in that state legislation in 1975 one of the responsibilities of the Advisory Council in Indiana is to promote vocational education. I'd like to take this

opportunity to tell you about our package, our SUCCESS program, in Indiana.

We have the television spots produced in 1970 and we redid those and redistributed them. We do the same kinds of things that Jack does--bug the stations. One of the things that we do now is communicate what they do to the FCC as a pat on the back as to how they do participate in public service. In addition we developed radio spots for both educational radio stations and the public stations with Chris Schenkel. We have a system of outdoor poster panels. Since 1969 the Indiana Outdoor Advertisers Association donates poster panels (we call those billboards). Two times a year we post on these billboards-400 around the state. the Junior Outdoor Advertisers Association wrote and asked if they could participate. So I said if you donate space you can participate. Now we also have 500 of the small poster panels posted through the state.

What happens when people do write SUCCESS, Box 350-B, Indianapolis, Indiana? Several things happen. First of all, they get a brochure. We also send that inquiree's name to the schools in that area. We also ask the schools to write back to us and tell us what happened with the inquiree.

The next question you're going to ask is how many people write? Last week there were 73 letters in our post office box asking about vocational education.

We added another venture to our SUCCESS program, and we filmed a 15-minute concept film and a television spot with the governor. I never want to do that again in my life. It was

work! And Woody will probably talk me into something else at some point in the future, but really I think it will pay off, and I think there's a whole wide field of ramifications that is just not one way. (We talked with) the Ball corporation--they said they were having a lot of trouble getting apprentices in a company program in Illinois. I said, "Fine." They said, "We don't know who to talk to." I said, "OK, I'll call Bill Nagel." I called Bill and set up some lines of communication for Ball corporation to work out some of their problems in getting apprentices for their program. I think some of these aspects that also enhance the public information program.

Part of the money for the concept film is through public solicitation. To General Motors I said, "I'd like $1000." They said, "Is that all?" I said, "Right at this moment that's all I want, but I'll be back for some other things."

What is the next idea? To take some of our footage and blow it up to 35mm for movie theaters and drive-ins. In Indiana the Council has made the decision that one of the best ways to promote vocational education is to do it constantly, consistently, and with class. Fortunately, through the services of Woody, with his persistence, we are able to do it constantly, and consistently, and because of his expertise, and the wisdom of the National Advisory Council being able to identify someone with such expertise, we're able to do it with class.

Woodhall (NACVE Staff): The following has been a paid commercial. I'd like to turn the meeting over now to Marvin.

Marvin Feldman (NACVE): For those of you who haven't had a chance to participate in the SUCCESS story, I guess you've gotten the message. Some of the canyons of these opportunities beyond the spots and the new image and the whole need to consistently promote vocational education is the kinds of dialogue. I think you've picked up the messages of how people begin to talk about it from a whole host of different views.

We had a dream at NACVE before the Congress clipped our wings last week. We had been talking about a film because of the Bi-Centennial. We thought that with the experiences that Woody has had all over the country we felt that we probably would be able to get a sponsor for a special somewhere along the bicentennial year to vocational education but of course we're going to have to start backing off of that. It doesn't necessarily follow, however, that all of Woody's planning and his scripts around that film which is really a number of concepts put into a single film shouldn't move forward. Woody, I don't know what your process is in describing this but I know that he would be very eager to exchange views with any of you after this presentation about what he had in mind on that concept.

Duane Lund (NACVE): We had decided we would not do what I'm about to do. But I'm going to say this anyway, because you should know about our problem. Unless something happens July 1, this all comes to an end. The Office of Education has been most helpful to us up to this time. Congress and the Hill have supported this kind of a project but they have let it be

known that they felt we should not use our regular budget dollars for this P.I. program.

So O.E., thanks to Bill Pierce and some before him, have supported our end of this project. Our costs are less than $40,000 a year to NACVE. But Bill Pierce has advised us that he just cannot work this out for us for one more year for a lot of bureaucratic reasons that are very real. So we see as our alternative, we've talked to some foundations--Marv as you may know worked for 8 years for Ford Foundation. He has talked to some foundations and they are not interested in getting into the filming business. We do know that industry is very interested in what we are doing. We are talking about the free enterprise system. As Marv told us yesterday noon, vocational education is the opposite of Marxism; it's the very base root of the free enterprise system. We're talking about work ethic; we're talking about restoring America's productivity. Industry is interested and has much at stake in what we are doing. We don't know quite how we are going to handle it, or how it's going to work, but the dollars have to come from industry--and that's our next and last resort.

What I'm asking this morning is this. Through your experiences, if you know individuals whom we can contact--we're not asking you to do it, we'll do it, I will go, Marv will go, Reg will go, Woody will go--(if we can go) to that industry and ask for help, will you get that word to Reg or me or to Woody or to Marv--whoever is handy? We know the industries who might be interested. What we need is someone to open the

door. If you've got a relative or a friend or someone who is in the hierarchy of an industry--it needn't be a nationwide concern, but that of course is the better if possible--and will give us the names of those individuals, we will do the work. We just don't want this good work to come to an end. And the time is very short. Unless we move immediately and get help from industry we are all through and out of business in July.

Fred Hoke: You'll notice on your schedule that the 11:00 meeting--the bicentennial preparation meeting--was scheduled for the Regency--it's right back here at the Yorktown. I would also remind you that the small group sessions start immediately at the conclusion of this meeting and there are no room changes--they're the same as on your program. Would you please make every attempt humanly possible to be here at 11:00 for the discussion and preparation meeting for October. As Woody said, this meeting in October is a cheer for vocational education, and certainly the NACVE and SACVE people need to become intricately involved in making sure that this meeting in October is extremely successful, not only for our own aggrandizement but also for the future of vocational education.

NACVE-SACVE JOINT FALL

BICENTENNIAL MEETING PLANNING

Larry Kitto, Chairman
Minnesota SAC

I have had a great deal of state advisory council involvement and to give you a little bit of history -- traditionally, there have been two joint meetings held each year, one in Washington, and one at some other location. There have always been some hassles with planning joint meetings, coordinating activities, etc., that always seem to get ironed out when we get on to the conference. I have to say this conference like all the rest ends up being organized pretty well and everybody goes away feeling that they have made some good accomplishments.

Based upon a planning questionnaire that was sent out about two years ago, a number of ad hoc planning groups to plan joint meetings were proposed and those proposals were voted upon and a plan was selected at the last Boston meeting. Basically, this planning group consists of the president and the regional vice presidents of the association of executive directors. There are five people and four chairmen from advisory councils from states other than those regional vice chairmen of executive committees: the co-chairmen, usually two co-chairmen of the joint

meetings, usually two members from NACVE, the executive director from NACVE, and the chairman of the most recent past conference. I would like to say that those guys have really been a help to me. I have really been able to pick their minds and determine what to do and more often what not to do when planning one of these conferences. I personally feel this is a good representative group of about fifteen or sixteen people and this is the makeup of the group that is planning this 1976 conference.

The last time we were in Boston it was also proposed that we set a procedure for selecting where the fall joint meeting would be held. A lot of concerns were expressed that it be moved around the country a bit. It so happened that the next region whose turn it was to host the conference was a central region. Central region people got together and caucused and decided that the meeting should be held in Minneapolis/St. Paul. Back in Boston in some of the regional caucuses, there were discussions as to whether or not to have two joint meetings a year. Some wanted to have one joint meeting and then some regional meetings. To this point, there has always been a lot of discussion. Maybe we should take a good look at this in the future and take some action. Why Minneapolis? My instant reaction is "Why not Minneapolis"?

A long time ago in Boston, Duane Lund (one of our superintendents in Minnesota) began talking about having a real big event -- a bicentennial conference. His discussions were pretty tentative, he was just kind of getting the feelings from everybody -- what people's thoughts on the subject were. Duane mentioned that since we might have a bicentennial conference, maybe it should be in Washington.

At the same time all of that was going on, we were really bidding to have a bicentennial conference in Minnesota. The central regions at the same time were saying, "Let's have a bicentennial conference in Minnesota." When we discovered we were talking about a bicentennial our reaction was "Why not in Minnesota"? where it ended. To plan this meeting you put together a pretty good group of people. These people have done a lot of work and need some recognition: Bruce Howell from Florida; Clint Harris; Gordon Kutscher, who has really put in a lot of work on the planning of these things to date; Wally Vog who has been on some of these planning sessions in the past; Helen Stuart, Paul Tschetter; Doug Fellows, Roy Stewart, from the Oklahoma advisory council; myself and a number of other members of the advisory council in Minnesota who are doing some in-state planning on some of the statistical and logistical types of things; Dean Dannewitz, our staff person who has

put a lot of time into the program; Duane Lund and Caroline Hughes who have really put a lot into the meeting; and Fred Hoke.

In the midst of all of this it was decided that there was just too much work for any particular committee to do so we expanded a bit and Duane Lund formed an ad hoc research committee consisting of Ray Parrot, Chuck Cromer, Si Bowlan, and Paul Tschetter, to get into the actual program and make the contacts and come up with what we feel at this point, is a marvelous program. Most of this process started a long time ago and several meetings of these people have taken place. It is important for you people to remember that there has been a lot of coordination, a lot of cooperation on the part of the people that have been involved in the planning, and many states have been involved in it. Duane Lund and Carolyn Hughes and members of NACVE staff and others have really put a lot of time and a lot of effort into getting us to the point where we are and I am really looking for an all-out good conference.

Basically, we want to do two other things here this morning, one is to give you a little bit of the meat of what the conference is actually going to be about. We are going to do that in two ways. Mabel Cason, who is a

member of the Minnesota advisory Council and who gave a presentation in Reno, is going to address you about what is actually going to happen in the program in Minnesota. Then we have some handouts that some of you may have seen in the past and some of you may not. In any case, we have up-dated them and are going to distribute them to you. Dean Dannewitz who is our staff director is going to give you a little sales job on Minnesota, the presenters, and who the people are who are going to be there, and exactly what you can look forward to as far as the facilities, etc. when you come out next fall. At this point, I would like to introduce Mabel Cason who is a member of our state advisory council.

Mabel Cason

Thank you, Larry, and as Larry has indicated we are expecting each one of you present to return to your state advisory council and encourage each member of the council to make plans and check their calendars for October 10 through 13 to come to the Twin Cities and have a marvelous time with each of the rest of us who will be in attendance. The conference plans and arrangements have progressed to date and we are very concerned that you should see as much of the state as possible and that is the reason we have planned it at a midway point between Minneapolis and St. Paul because I refuse to let Minneapolis take all the honors. I am from

St. Paul as are some of the other members of our state advisory council. The joint conference planning committee has been working on the conference theme, "A Futuristic Look at Vocational Education." We have, through the committee, obtained nationally prominent speakers who will be commissioned to present future oriented papers which will provide a fresh look and mind-stretching insight in viewing the role of vocational education. The purposes of the conferences are threefold. First of all, we want to increase the ability of those concerned with vocational education to look at the future. In other words, to expand their horizons. Secondly, to examine the influence of forces which impact upon vocational education decisions and policy making now and also in the future. Thirdly, to ascertain the potential vocational education policy framework and guidelines which might be developed to meet the needs and demands of the future. There will be two levels of papers at the conference. There will be several major presentations and ten to fifteen forum presentations. The several major presentations have been selected and I am sure that you will agree with me that they are three top-notch people. The Honorable David Mathew, Secretary of HEW, Mr. W. Willard Wirtz, President of the Manpower Institute and past Secretary of Labor, and Dr. Henry David, Professor of Public Affairs at the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the

University of Texas at Austin, and former Chairman of the National Academy of Science. Written acceptances have already been received from Mr. Wirtz and Dr. David and an acceptance from Secretary Mathews is expected shortly. Eli Ginsberg, Chairman of the National Commission on Manpower Policy and Director of the Conservation of Human Resources of Columbia University will also make a major presentation.

The fifteen forum presenters have been invited. They, too, have accepted and are: Maurice Mitchell, the Chancellor of the University of Denver and former Chairman of the Board of the Encyclopedia Brittanica; G. Theodore Mitay, Chancellor of the Minnesota State University System; Carolyn Warner, Superintendent of Public Instruction in Arizona; James Hammond, Chancellor of Massachusetts State College System; Guy Dobbs, Vice President of the Xerox Corporation; Thelma Daley, President of APGA; David Gottlieb, Dean of the College of Social Science, the University of Houston; Carol Gibson, Director of Education for the National Urban League; Calvin Dupree, Native American Education, University of Lethbridge, Canada; Walter Davis, Director of Education, AFL-CIO; Mark Gold, Children's Research Center, The University of Illinois; Fred McClure, Youth Leader of the University of Texas; Paul Gibson, Youth Leader, Gonzago University, Gordon Swanson,

Professor at the University of Minnesota; and Ed Fiske, Editor of the New York Times who has agreed to do a summary wrap up of the many presentations on the morning of the last day.

The planning committee has also provided for several alternatives. As you can see, efforts have been made to include the viewpoints of all factions: educators, students, labor, industry, government, and social services. This conference will be more than seeking solutions to current problems that exist today. Some hard questions will be raised. The intent will not be to provide you with all the answers but to present some challenges and some mind-stretching topics. The conference presentations will be aimed at suggesting what society might be like in the future, what the needs of society might be, the total American vocational education system as it attempts to train people for the world of work, and examining the total educational system with suggestions as to how it can be improved to meet the needs that can be foreseen. These objectives will be incompassed in six different topic areas which are: future vocational education delivery system; future international aspects of vocational education system; the demographic considerations of the future; what should be taught in the future; the special needs of minorities, disadvantaged, handicapped, and women; and future economic,

po'itical, and sociological impact on vocational education planning and so forth. We're looking even to the inclusion of more topics as they are brought to our attention both through your committee on planning or through our state office.

We are pleased to report that Congressman Albert Quie of Minnesota, who is the ranking mindrity member of the House Education and Labor Committee and a strong and influencial advocate of vocational education, has agreed to serve as our honorary chairman for the conference. He will deliver the keynote address. The audience at the conference promises to be just as diversified as the speakers. Invitations will be sent to business, industrial, and labor representatives, the consumers of vocational educational products, legislators, government officials and, of course, the national and state advisory councils. Dean Dannewitz who is our executive director for the Minnesota council, will go into more detail and show you some slides to make you think in terms of October 10 through the 13 for our bicentennial conference. This is your conference as well as ours here in Minnesota. I look forward to seeing everyone of you who has been in attendance here in Minnesota.

Dean Dannewitz, Executive Director, SAC, Minnesota

Now that you have an overview of the conference, I want to fill you in on the agenda format, the facilities, the funding, the registration, and, above all, try to answer any questions you may have about the conference. This is our first opportunity to report to you on the great job this committee has been doing. I will repeat what Duane Lund said yesterday, "this has been a very cooperative, coordinated committee and it is proof that this planning committee set-up does work." And, I think it should be continued if it comes up in the future.

We are shooting for around 1,500 solid registrants for this conference. The average joint conference participation is around 300. The life blood of the conference is the attendees, so that is why we want to use you as salesmen to go back to your council, your people and promote the conference. I think that the basic part of the conference, the presenters as we are calling them, are going to be developing papers. They are going to be there to have questions asked to them as presenters. It is not going to be an educator meets educator format, it is going to be a public, industry, business, and education format. Now to repeat the dates, the conference will be October 10th - 13th, Tuesday, and Wednesday. This is a change from past formats when the

conference was from Wednesday through Friday. We thought we should try to get people in late on Sunday afternoon, have them relax, have registration over with by that time, and then enjoy a reception sponsored by the Minnesota state advisory council and the central states association or the group of councils that make up the central states. The reception will be held in the Garden Court of the Radisson Blackstone Hotel in Bloomington, Minnesota. Then on Monday, we will have the opening remarks. Larry Kitto, chairperson of the Minnesota council, will open the proceedings and the mayors of Minneapolis and St. Paul will be present.

The keynote address will be by Congressman Quie, the very strong advocate of vocational education, who is from the state of Minnesota. He will also be the honorary chairman of the entire conference. Then at about 10:00 a.m. on the first day, we will have the first major presentation, and these major presentations will be available in summary form either during or shortly after they are presented. The major papers, however, will not be published nor available at that time because we want to publish them in a different form as a result of the conference. The major presenters will face a meet the press format of key people who understand education and who are involved in the topic that will be presented. There also will be questions from the

floor.

We plan to have Governor Wendell Anderson of Minnesota give the luncheon address. In the afternoon sessions, we will have three groups of the forum presenters in the smaller breakout rooms and you will be able to select the topic that you prefer. The group meetings will end at 5:00 and at 7:00 p.m., we have a banquet for all the registrants with a presentation by Fred McClure, who is the youth leader from Texas A & M University.

On Tuesday we will start at 9:00 a.m. with the second major presenter and then the three groups of the forum presenters. We will have a luncheon speaker that day with the youth speaker and a question and answer session. The Wednesday morning session would be the final presentations and a summary and an overview by Ed Fiske, who is the education editor of the New York Times. So, the agenda is filled with significant things, not the type of things that we usually have in this sort of joint meeting.

NACVE has assumed the responsibility for obtaining funding for the program presenters, for the papers that are being commissioned, and the associated expenses. They have asked a consortium of eight Minnesota foundations and businesses, who do this quite regularly, for contributions of, perhaps, $5,000 apiece. We have received commitments for $10,000 of that amount already from two of the businesses. The

others will be coming in very soon.

The budget is approximately $40,000, or really more. There has been some misunderstanding about soliciting some of these state advisory councils for direct funding and if you have any questions about that, let me just say that we could always use some help. We would gladly accept any funding that you could provide this committee to make the bicentennial conference a success. We do not want to exert any pressure, we know that you have difficulty with this fort of funding, but we have arrangements so that we can provide billing or whatever way you want it. We could use that sort of funding from the state advisory councils and would welcome it. You would also get recognition from the bicentennial in some form that will be determined.

The registration fees for the conference have been set at $35.00 because we don't want to discourage people from coming by going to $50.00. But, as Fred has found out, $35.00 doesn't cover a lot nowadays. We plan to have two luncheons and a banquet plus all of the incidental registration fees and clerical help and so forth come out of that registration fee.

Let's deal with the invitation problem. This week, you received in your council office, a letter from NACVE asking you to prepare a list of at least fifty names of the most

important decision-makers in the state. the ones you would like to see invited to such a bicentennial conference. We would like to get thatlist into the National Advisory Council Office as soon as possible because it is late already to get out such an invitation list. There has to be a mailing between the 15th of May and early in June. The list has to be called down, corrected, duplicated, eliminated, and so forth. A lot of work has to go on after you have provided the National Council with the list.

Question: Yes, Martha (Bachman)

One question, should the list of names include a roster of the State Advisory Council members?

Answer: No. If you want to, give us 150 names. We are working with numbers here. If we want to generate 1,500 people and there are fifty states or state advisory councils and we get a ten percent return from our invitation list, it will be pretty good. We can't really expect much more than that.

Question from the floor (not audible).

Answer: That is up to them. You may be surprised the people that you may not think will attend. So let's not second guess them. That is their choice. But you can put them in priority order. The point is that we plan to send out these invitations and they will be in the form of a card invitation

from Congressman Quie. It will be a very formal type of thing, very proper. Please give us the list as soon as possible. Give us more than fifty names if possible.

Question from the floor.

We are looking for major business and industry people, not just educators. Labor organizations, state and local chambers of commerce, state legislators, civic organizations, and also the educators.

Question from the floor.

One o'clock is checkout. Registration cards, etc., will be handled through the National Advisory Council Office. We want everything to go in there and then cleared back to us.

We have blocked out 600 rooms during the conference. The rates are $26.00 for single and $34.00 for double. Incidentally, you may bring spouses because we will be planning a spouse program, tours and so forth if there is interest generated in it.

The communications and publicity is very important. We want to have nationwide press coverage and we plan to try to videotape the entire session, the presenters, and the questions and answers. We are going to be working with our local educational TV channel to do this.

APPENDICES

201

JOINT MEETING SCHEDULE

SCHEDULE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 5

6 - 7:30 p.m. — EARLY REGISTRATION
Columbia Foyer

7:30 - 8:30 — Meeting of NACVE-SACVE Chairpersons and Executive Directors
Columbia Ballroom A & B

(All early registrants welcome to attend.)

8:30 - 9:30 — Executive Directors Meeting
Columbia Ballroom A & B

THURSDAY, MAY 6

7:30 - 8:30 a.m. — REGISTRATION
Columbia Foyer

9 - 9:15 — Meeting Convenes
Columbia Ballroom A & B

9:15 - 10:00 — Keynote Address
Dr. T.H. Bell
Commissioner of Education,
U.S. Office of Education
Columbia Ballroom A & B

10 - 11:30 — Panel: View of SACVE Role From the Perspective of Other Agencies
Columbia Ballroom A & B

Noon - 1:30 p.m. — LUNCHEON
Report from the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education
Yorktown Room

1:30 - 2:00 — Transitional Meeting from the Morning Session
Columbia Ballroom A & B

2 - 3:00 — Congressional Briefing on the Status of Vocational Education Legislation
Columbia Ballroom A & B

Ms. Jean Frohlicher
Associate Counsel, Sub-Committee on Education
U.S. Senate

Mr. John Jennings
Counsel, Sub-Committee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education
U.S. House of Representatives

Mr. Gregory Fusco
Minority Counsel, Sub-Committee on Education
U.S. Senate

3 - 3:30 — REFRESHMENT BREAK
Columbia Foyer

3:30 - 5:00 — Discussion Group Session One

(Discussions on the Effectiveness of State Advisory Councils)

GROUP 1: Evaluation
Valley Forge Room

GROUP 2: Coordination, Articulation and Duplication of Programs
Columbia A

GROUP 3: State Plan
Columbia B

GROUP 4: Special Advisory Council Activities
Columbia C

6:30 - 7:30 — RECEPTION
Yorktown Room

FRIDAY, MAY 7

8 - 9:30 a.m. — BREAKFAST

Films on Vocational Education Featuring the Public Information Project
Yorktown Room

9:30 - 11:00 — Discussion Group Session Two

(Participants attend different session from the previous day.)

GROUP 1: Evaluation
Valley Forge Room

GROUP 2: Coordination, Articulation and Duplication of Programs
Columbia A

GROUP 3: State Plan
Columbia B

GROUP 4: Special Advisory Council Activities
Columbia C

11 - Noon — Bicentennial Preparation
Regency Room

A Briefing by the Planning Committee on the NACVE-SACVE Fall Joint Bicentennial Meeting in Minneapolis, Minnesota

Discussion Follows

Noon — MEETING ADJOURNS

204

ANALYSIS OF PENDING FEDERAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION LEGISLATION

205

National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

legislative scoreboard

5 MAY 76

COMPARISON OF

S. 2657

AND

H.R. 12835

WITH

P.L. 90-576

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

AMENDMENTS

OF 1968

For further information contact:
George Wallrodt
202/376-8873

1968 Amendments

TLE I - VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
'art A - General Provisions
;ec. 101 Declaration of Purpose

Authorizes Federal grants to states to
assist to maintain, extend, improve ex-
sting programs, develop new programs,
provide part-time employment for youth
who need assistance to continue training

sec. 102 Authorization of Appropriations

ec. 103 Allotment Among States
Allotment ratio cited, formula defined

S.2657

TITLE II - VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
Extends 1968 Amendments through FY 1977

Effective 1978, amends VEA to read:
TITLE I - VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
Part A - State Vocational Education Programs
sec. 101 Declaration of Purpose

Assist states improve planning for use of all resources for voc ed and manpower training; achieve equitable distribution of funds among secondary, postsecondary, adult programs, through involvment of wide range of agencies in planning voc ed policy and programs.
Federal grants for planning, and to assist to extend, improve, where necessary maintain existing programs for persons of all ages, realistic re actual employment opportunities.

sec. 102 Authorization of Appropriations
$650 million - FY 1978; $750 million - FY 1979;
$850 million - FY 1980; $950 million - FY 1981;
$1 billion - FY 1982, for state grants

Disadvantaged - Special Programs:
$70 million - FY 1978; $80 million - FY 1979;
$90 million - FY 1980; $100 million for each FY 1980 - 82

Such sums as necessary for one-half cost of administration of state plan.

sec. 103 Allotment Among States
same as 68 Amendments
Reserves $5 million for Sec. of Labor for manpower studies at request of education officials or advisory councils.

H.R. 12835

Sec. - Extensions of Programs
Extends 1968 Amendments through FY 1977

Effective 1978, amends VEA to read:

Declaration of Purpose - unchanged

Sec. 10 - State Vocational Education Programs
Consolidates all categories into one basic grant, except Consumer & Homemaking and Bilingual.

Authorization of Appropriations
$800 million - FY 1978; $950 million - FY 1979;
$1,100,000,000 - FY 1980; $1,250,000,000 - FY1981;
$1,450,000,000 suceeding years
-for consolidated grants to states

Uses of Federal Funds
Adds: supportive services; program improvement; construction & operation of residential schools; cooperative education; work-study; programs to eliminate sex discrimination & stereotyping; day care services for children of students.
Retains 15% setaside for postsecondary.
Increases set-aside for disadvantaged to 25%; retains 10% for handicapped; both to be specifically matched with state/local funds.
50% matching, except 100% Federal funds for special programs for disadvantaged; exemplary programs by RCUs; cooperative education.
75% Federal funds for administration in FY 1978, 50% thereafter.

Sec. 2 - Allotments - formula unchanged.
Reserves 5% of basic grant to Commissioner for Programs of National Significance (present Parts C,D, I, & EPDA, Pt. F).
Not to exceed 1% of basic grant transferred to Bureau of Indian Affairs, for voc ed programs.

1968 Amendments	S. 2657	
no comparable provisions	no comparable provisions	Sec. 5 - Federal Administration Amends sec. 1071 of Higher Education Act, and transfers to VEA, to establish Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education responsible for administration of vocational & adult education acts, and functions of USOE relating to manpower. Commissioner shall assign to Bureau at least as many persons as were assigned in FY 1967 to directly administer VEA. Bureau shall conduct, between 1977 and 1981, a comprehensive review of voc ed programs in each state. HEW shall conduct fiscal audits.
sec. 104 National & State Advisory Councils (a)(1) NACVE established -membership -representation (2) functions: advise Commissioner on administration, regulations, operation; review programs, recommendations to Sec.; conduct independent evaluations. Review possible duplication at post-secondary and adult levels.	Part G - General Provisions sec. 172 National Advisory Council adds representation re: guidance and counseling, correctional institutes, Nat'l Commission for Manpower Policy. Advise President, Congress, Secretary, Commissioner on administration, regulations, budget requests, operations. Review vocational, manpower programs under all statutes, make recommendations, other reports to head of any Federal agency. In cooperation with Nat'l Comm. for Manpower Policy, identify voc ed and manpower needs, assess extent to which programs represent coordinated approach. Conduct independent evaluations. Technical assistance to SACVEs.	Sec. 6 - Advisory Councils National Advisory Council - adds representation from National Commission for Manpower Policy; field of guidance & counseling; non-profit private schools; women with backgrounds & experience in employment & training programs and knowledgeable re: sex discrimination in job training & employment, including women who are members of minority groups. NACVE to have majority of members not educators or education administrators. Members' terms to extend until successors named. Add to present duties: technical assistance and leadership to SACVEs. Identify, after consultation with National Commission for Manpower Policy, vocational & manpower needs of Nation, assess extent to which voc ed, employment training, voc. rehab, and other programs represent consistent, coordinated approach. Comment annual on report of National Commission on Manpower Policy. Appropriations: $450,000 - FY 1978; $475,000 - FY1979; $500,000 - FY 1980 and 1981. NACVE may accept gifts, transfers of funds from agencies, if related to functions described in act. CETA amended to provide for representative of NACVE on National Commission for Manpower Policy. Commission to comment annually on NACVE reports.
sec. 104 (b)(1) SACVEs established -appointment -representation -functions: advise State board on plan, evaluate and report with recommendations Funding: 1 percent, but not less than $50,000, more than $150,000	sec. 105 State Advisory Council adds representation re: guidance and counseling, correctional institutes. Advise state board in development of comprehensive long-range and annual program plans. Be actively involved in all stages of planning. Funding: unchanged	State Advisory Councils - Provides three-year staggered terms. Adds representative of State Manpower Services Council; guidance & counseling; local school boards; voc ed teachers and administrators;

non-profit private schools; women with background & experience in employment & training programs who are knowledgeable re: sex discrimination in job training and employment, including minority women.
Adds functions: Assist State Board in establishing local advisory councils. Meet annually with Board to analyze state plan, work out differences. Any group represented on SACVE which disagrees with Board may appeal to Commissioner. Identify, after consulting with State Manpower Services Council, voc ed & manpower needs and assess extent to which voc ed, employment training, voc rehab, other programs represent coordinated approach. Comment annually on reports of Manpower Services Council.
Stresses SACVE independence, providing that SACVE determine own procedures and staffing, independent of programmatic and administrative control by other State boards or agencies.
Funds not to exceed $300,000, nor less than $100,000. Expenditure determined solely by SACVE for carrying out functions under act; may not be diverted or reprogrammed by any state agency. SACVE to designate appropriate State agency as fiscal agent.
CETA amended to provide representation by SACVE on State Manpower Services Council. SMSC to comment annually on SACVE reports.

sec. 108 Definitions

Part G - General Provisions
sec. 171 Definitions
no definitions of vocational education
(drafters felt bill speaks for itself)

Sec. 8 - Definitions
"vocational education" - training in public or private secondary or postsecondary institutions, at work site, or under innovative arrangement, under public supervision; to prepare for gainful employment or enrollment in advanced vocational programs (including those which might lead to baccalaureate degree); does not include construction, acquisition of land or buildings, or initial equipment of facilities.

"disadvantaged" includes educationally as well as economic disadvantaged.
"administration" excludes ancillary services such as curriculum development, evaluation, teacher training.

1968 Amendments

3 - State Voc Ed Programs

122 Uses of Federal Funds
ndary, postsecondary voc ed;
ining of adults, 15% setaside
vantaged; 10% setaside handi-
; construction, guidance and
eling, private schools, ancil-
services, such as teacher
ng, evaluation; improved
administration, state plan
opment.

123 State Plans
ires annual and long-term plan,
ates state board sole agency.
rements for fiscal control, record
ng, program objectives.

124 Payments to States
natching for state grants

S. 2657

Part A - State Voc Ed Programs
sec. 104 - State Planning Commission
to develop long-range and annual plans; State Board to administer. Commission membership: representatives of state agencies responsible for secondary voc ed, community & junior colleges, higher education, State Manpower Services Council, business, industry, labor, agriculture, general public, voc ed students. However, if a representative of each State agency certifies that the agency has had the opportunity to participate in development, implementation, and evaluation of the state plans, the Commissioner shall waive the requirement to establish the State Planning Commission, and the State Board shall carry out the functions of the Commission.
Authorizes sums as may be needed to pay one-half cost of planning activities.

sec. 106 Comprehensive Long-Range Plan
Not less than four years, more than six. Overall voc ed, manpower goals, describe planned use of Federal, state, local funds. Assess needs, facilities, project enrollment and needs. Utilize all existing facilities, including secondary, higher ed, manpower centers, others. Provide procedure to resolve differences between educators. Develop procedures to assure continuous planning, collection of data.

sec. 107 General Application
Local application must relate to manpower programs under CETA, and links to other local programs, to assure coordination.
Priority given to local applications stressing handicapped, disadvantaged, new and emerging occupations. Programs must be job related and lead to employment

H.R.12835

Sec. 4 - State Administration
Sole state agency to develop 3 year State Plan and annual accountability reports. May delegate administration, operation or supervision to other state agencies.

Sec. 7 - General Application
Requires cooperation with SACVE, other agencies in formulation of state plans; Federal funds may not supplant state or local funds; distribution based on economic, social, demographic factors, and relative ability of LEA; applications from LEA must be developed with any local advisory council established by act. Permits financially hard-pressed LEAs to waive maintenance of effort if all alternatives have been exhausted.

Sec. 9 - Planning, Reports, and Evaluations
Authorizes $25 million beginning FY 1977 for allocation among states for planning, evaluations.

State Plan - State Board must involve "active participation" of agencies responsible for community & junior colleges; higher education; postsecondary occupational education; elementary & secondary (if separate from State Board); 1202 Commission; State Manpower Services Council, SACVE.
Assess job skill needs; explicitly state objectives for meeting particular skills, including courses, projected enrollment, allocation of funds at all levels. State means for achieving objectives and reasons for choosing particular means. Commissioner shall not approve plan until specific findings of compliance are made, adequate procedures set forth to assure implementation of plan.

Annual Accountability Report - report of preceding fiscal year submitted by Dec. 31, to include updating of 3 year plan, show extent to which objectives of plan have been achieved, show exactly how state and local funds were used to achieve objectives, and allocation of funds among uses authorized in act.

1968 Amendments	S. 2657	H.R. 12835
	sec. 108 Annual Program Plan State Advisory Council must be actively involved in all stages. Requires consultation with State Manpower Services Council. Describe distribution of funds, how they further long-range goals. Report of last year's expenditures, if they achieved planned goals. Annual plan can amend long-range plan.	Commissioner shall approve annual report by March 1 of following year; transmit to state an analysis, with suggestions for improvement, and findings of any program or fiscal audits made by HEW. Evaluation - State Board must evaluate each program assisted with Federal funds, and share reports with SACVEs. USOE to prescribe nationally uniform criteria for evaluation, to include placement, evaluation by employers. SACVEs to assist and monitor State Board evaluations, and to use results in making its own evaluation and reports.
	sec. 110 Persons With Special Needs Handicapped 10% setaside, disadvantaged 15% setaside, each specifically matched with 40 percent state/local funds. Special Programs under 102 (b) 100% funding, no state match.	
	sec. 111 Payments to States 50% matching for state grants 50% matching, state plan administration	Vocational Education Data - Commissioner and Administrator of National Center for Education Statistics to develop vocational education data reporting and accounting system by Oct. 1977. States shall comply in their reports with data required by the system. Commission to use data for annual report on status of vocational education in the Nation. Establishes National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee to coordinate data between voc ed, CETA, other programs, by 1977. Each state to establish State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee.
t C - Research and Training ovides 50% of funds for mmissioner; 50% for states.	Part H - Research purposes unchanged from 68 Amendments. 50% total discretionary to Commissioner, 50% to states. $65 million - FY 1978; $75 million - FY 1979; $85 million - FY 1980; $95 million - FY 1981.	Sec. 12 - Part E - PROGRAMS OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE 5% of grants to states reserved to Commissioner for programs of national significance, including research. Includes not in excess of $5 million per year to support a National Center for Research in Voc Ed, chosen on a competitive basis every five years. Authorizes a Coordinating Committee on Research in Voc Ed in HEW to develop national priorities and coordinate activity between participating agencies.

1968 Amendments	S. 2657	H.R. 12835
no comparable provision	Part B - Ancillary Services Subpart 1 - Vocational Guidance and Counseling sec. 121 Purpose Assist states in providing guidance and counseling to persons of all ages. sec. 122 Authorization of Appropriations $25 million - FY 1978; $35 million -FY 1979; $45 million - FY 1980; $55 million -FY 1981; $75 million - FY 1982 sec. 123 Uses of Funds Includes job placement, follow-up; programs in prisons; vocational resource centers for out-of-school persons. sec. 124 Cooperative Arrangements Must cooperate with employment service, voc rehab service, etc.	Consolidated in basic grants to states under supportive services, including guidance and counseling activity, training and re-training of counselors, and placement services. Also counseling for women in programs traditionally limited to men.
tion Professions Development - Part F	Part B - Ancillary Services Subpart 2 - Voc Ed Personnel Training sec. 127 Authorization of Appropriations $10 million - FY 1978; $15 million -FY 1979; $20 million - FY 1980; $25 million -FY 1981; $30 million - FY 1982 Any person eligible without present screening process and recommendation. May attend any institute which offers appropriate program; not limited to current list of 20 schools. Provides for exchange between educators and business, on-the-job exnerience for teachers. Prepare journeymen for teaching; stresses new and emerging occupations	Part E - Programs of National Significance Training and Development Programs for Vocational Education Personnel consolidated under Commissioner's 5%. Provides advanced study, up to 3 years, for vocational instructors, administrators, supervisors, teacher educators, researchers, guidance and counseling personnel. Applicants must have at least 2 years experience in vocational or industrial training, military technical training, or social science research applicable to voc ed. U.S. Commissioner may provide grants to help remedy shortage of voc ed teachers. Eligible would be persons in industry with needed skills, but lacking credentials, and unemployed academic instructors willing to retrain to become voc ed teachers, but they must have vocational skills.

1968 Amendments	S. 2657	H.R. 12835
rt D - Exemplary Programs & Projects c. 141 Finding, and Purpose o stimulate creation of bridges between hool and work, promote cooperation tween education and manpower agencies	Part C - Innovation Subpart 1 - Exemplary Programs & Projects sec. 131 Purpose Develop, disseminate programs to assist persons in making occunational choices, acquiring skills and understanding for career success.	Part E - Programs of National Significance Exemplary Programs consolidated under Commissioner's 5% funds. Coordinating Committee on Research in Vocational Education, composed of Commissioner, NIE Director, and Foundation for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education to establish national priorities for research, innovation, and curriculum development, coordinate efforts of various agencies to avoid duplication, and develop effective monitoring, evaluation, and dissemination of projects.
c. 142 Authorization of Grants 0% funds to Commissioner 0% to states	sec. 132 Authorization of Grants $20 million - FY 1978; $30 million -FY 1979; $40 million - FY 1980; $50 million -FY 1981; $75 million - FY 1982 50% to Commissioner, 50% to states	
c. 143 Uses of Funds amiliarize students with opportunities, th special emphasis on disadvantaged; ucational experience through work; oaden curriculum; teacher training.	sec. 132 Uses of Funds For urban and rural areas of high need; guidance and counseling for unemployed; correlate voc ed with labor market needs; initial job placement, cooperation with business and labor.	
	sec. 134 Conditions of Grants and Contracts Must coordinate with state plan, other programs. Three year limit, must then be picked up by state funding	
rt E - Residential Voc Ed	no comparable provision	Residential schools consolidated and permitted under basic grants to states. Special consideration to be given to needs of large urban areas and isolated rural areas with substantial dropouts and unemployment. No funds may be used for schools to which juveniles are assigned as result of delinquent conduct, or where racial segregation is permitted.
art F - Consumer & Homemaking ec. 161 Purposes Prepare students for dual role of omemaker and wage earner, consumer ducation, emphasis on social and ultural conditions. one-third of funds for depressed reas, with 90 percent funding; therwise, 50% funding match.	Part F - Consumer & Homemaking sec. 161 Authorization of Appropriations $50 million - FY 1978; $60 million -FY 1979; $70 million - FY 1980; $75 million -FY 1981; $80 million - FY 1982 Purpose and funding unchanged	Sec. 11 - Part D - Home Economics for Consumer Education, Family Resource Management, and Life Skills. $60 million - FY 1978; $70 million - FY 1979; $80 million - FY 1980; $90 million - FY 1981. One-third of Federal funds reserved for areas of high unemployment and economically depressed areas; This portion, 90% Federal funds, remainder 50% matching

1968 Amendments	S. 2657	H.R. 12835
rt G - Cooperative Vocational Education	Part D - Student Programs Subpart 2 - Cooperative Vocational Education	Non-occupational home economics courses permitted to continue. Encourages, but does not mandate, broadening scope of home economics to include programs relating to wage earner responsibilities, special problems of women working outside the home, elimination of sex bias. Life skills emphasizes food and nutrition, child development, programs for teenage mothers, care of aging, divorce, etc. States must fund programs at postsecondary and adult levels, as well as secondary. By Jan. 1979, NIE to complete study of success of home economics programs and analyze use of funds.
c. 171 Findings and Purpose rovide education related work-study, imburse employers, support services	Purposes the same as 68 Amendments	
c. 173 Plan Requirement ooperation with employment agencies, bor, business; training for teacher ordinators; priority for areas with gh dropout rates	sec. 147 Authorization of Appropriations $25 million - FY 1978; $30 million -FY 1979; $35 million - FY 1980; $40 million -FY 1981; $50 million - FY 1982	Cooperative vocational education and work-study programs consolidated in basic grants to states. Coop programs must provide cooperation with employment agencies, labor groups, employers, community agencies. Reimburse employers for added costs of on-the-job training, if related to existing career opportunities susceptible of promotion, and which do not displace other workers. Permits teacher training curriculum materials, evaluation. Priority to areas with high rates of dropouts and youth unemployment.
rt H - Work Study Programs	Subpart 1 - Work Study Programs	
c. 182 Plan Requirement mployment for students in need of rnings to continue education, ages -21. Limits on hours, earnings. blic agency employment.	Purposes same as 68 Amendments No restriction on number of hours worked. Sec. 141 Authorization of Appropriations $45 million - FY 1978; $50 million -FY 1979; $55 million - FY 1980; $60 million each for FY 1981-82	Work-study for full time students in need of earnings at least 15 years old, less than 21. No student to be employed for compensation which exceeds payments under comparable Federal programs. Employment shall be for local education agency or other public agency or institution.
rt I - Curriculum Development	Part C - Innovation Subpart 2 - Curriculum Development	
c. 191 o assist in development of curri-lums for new and changing occupations d improve dissemination. ants made by Commissioner, after con-ltation with state agency and NACVE. velop standards for curriculum devel-ment, coordinate efforts of states; st available material; evaluation; rsonnel training	Purposes same as 68 Amendments sec. 137 Authorization of Appropriations $10 million for each fiscal year	Curriculum Development consolidated under Commissioner 5% funds. Authorizes Commissioner to make contracts to convert armed services curriculum materials to civilian use.

1968 Amendments	S. 2657	H.R. 12839
Part J - Bilingual Education	Part J - Bilingual Education $40 million - FY 1978; $60 milljon - FY 1979; $80 million - FY 1980. Purposes substantially the same as 68 Amendments. In addition, Part A grants to states earmarks $40 million per year for bilingual programs.	Part F - Bilinual Education $80 million for FY 1978 and 1979; $100 million for FY 1980 and 1981. Purposes substantially the same as 68 Amendments.
no comparable provision	Part E - Emergency Assistance for Remodeling and Rennovation of Voc Ed Facilities sec. 151 Purpose Assistance to urban, rural areas with obsolete facilities or equipment sec. 152 Authorization of Appropriations $25 million for FY 1977; $50 million -FY 1978; $75 million - FY 1979; $100 million -FY 1980 sec. 153 Applications Local agency applies to Commissioner, thru state board. Approved and ranked by age and condition of facility, rate of youth unemployment in area. Applications funded from the top down until funds exhausted. 75% Federal funding.	no comparable provision
no comparable provision	no comparable provision	Sec. 13 - Study of Vocational Education NIE to report by Sept. 1980 on study of voc ed, including distribution of funds in terms of services, occupations, target populations, enrollments to meet greatest human resource needs of next 10 years. Analysis of means of assessing program quality and effectiveness. Not to exceed $2 million per year authorized for study.
no comparable provision	no comparable provision	Sec. 14 - Paperwork National Center for Education Statistics shall coordinate data collection, formation and issuance of applications, and all other reports to eliminate excessive detail or redundant information requests.

DISCUSSION GROUP SESSION SUMMARIES

Small Group Discussions
(those recorded)

Thursday, May 6, 1976

Group 1 - Evaluation

Chairperson
Gordon Kutscher, Executive Director
Missouri
Harlan Giese, Executive Director, Iowa
Recorder

Session opened with transparency presentation by chairpersons.

Evaluation must take place in the environment of education in general. To do this job, must have the input and output. Between the input and output you must have a process or processor. Feedback must also be included to have a complete cycle.

The above items include:

1. Setting goals and objectives of the councils. (Must know the needs).

2. Data collection system. What do you need or what do you need to get.

3. Need to analyze data.

4. Formulate the reports--findings and conclusions.

5. Council interpretates the findings and conclusions.

6. Council reports.

7. Council makes recommendations.

Discussion followed on:

I. What is evaluation?

Accountability
Organization
Council Objectives

Somehow feedback is necessary to see what is happening as a result of the report.

Somehow evaluation scope must be narrowed so that inpact can be effective.

Evaluation should be comparative among states.

Evaluations should focus on results and not administrative procedures.

II. How is council organized for evaluation?

-- Public hearing for data collection

-- Committee structure with specific topical focus with aid of outside consultants for data collection

-- Majority of states organize to committee structure to complete evaluation

III. How do you determine your evaluation objectives?

-- Look at the state plan

-- Public hearing comments

IV. Standardization (of the reporting system)

Validation--

Vast differences within the states create difficulty in standardized federal reporting system.

The states should focus on the changes that should be made within the state and therefore standardization may be extremely difficult. Advisory Councils need to focus on the unique problems and structures within their state.

* * * * *

Friday, May 7, 1976

Group 1 - Evaluation

Chairperson
John Shannon, Executive Director
Ohio

Virginia Vieregg, Recorder
Nebraska

All we do as Advisory Councils is based on evaluation. To give advice, we must have a base. Many feel that councils lack expertise to do this but they do possess ability and initiative to secure this expertise.

Ohio uses PRIDE program for self-evaluation in schools. Ohio, with supervision of State Division of Vocational Education has just completed five-year evaluation called PRIDE. (Program Review for Improvement Development and Expansion in Vocational Education and Guidance)

Two basic parts of Missouri evaluation instrument concerns itself with input and output. As a council, what do we evaluate? Input, process, output product?

One of more difficult parts for any council is data collection. All areas of concern become a part of evaluation. These consist of needs, financing, research, evaluation, coordination, services and delivery. Councils need not consider all these in any one year but long range goal should be to consider the total.

Heavy criticism of vocational education demonstrate a new awareness by the general public. There is a real need for accountability now and because of the high cost of vocational programs, a most critical analysis is directed toward this education.

What is evaluation? Results of a certain program? It is good or bad? What kind of product is being turned out? Are you getting your dollars worth back from funds spent?

An attempt to justify a program by an unobjective evaluation is wrong. The bureaucratic assumption is that all programs must be a success. This requires more dollars inevitably.

Problem in differentiating accountability from evaluation. There can be as many differences in interpretation of evaluation as there are people in a room.

What things should a council not be evaluating?

1. We should not be evaluating individuals. This will quickly destroy the value and credibility of a council.

2. We do have to be aware of the needs of industry before evaluating success or failure of programs offered in a curriculum.

3. Council should not be entering classrooms and evaluating teaching methods.

Council is primarily interested in measuring product, process, effort, needs assessment and what is being done. This evaluation should be done on a broad basis. Council may point out problem without drawing attention to individuals.

Methods of evaluation can be considered as means rather than the role of evaluation in decision making process.

Should the council base its decision making on subjective opinion, personal experience (which necessarily includes bias)? Feeling is that subjective judgement cannot be discounted but should certainly not be of prime consideration.

How do councils make their decisions?

West Virginia works with State Department of Vocational Education to supply material, discuss and enable council to be aware of vocational problems in the Vocational Department which could influence decision making. Where does head counting come in? Is this part of evaluation? How many people are actually being placed in programs they were trained for?
The only headcount that CETA concern's itself with is how many people got jobs.

Impossible to evaluate without being aware of objectives, plan or program hopes to accomplish.

There is a feeling that objectives should be evaluated as to whether or not they are concerned with the needs that have been demonstrated in any individual state.

Summary of Discussion Group 2 (May 6) - Coordination, Articulation, and Duplication

The discussion was co-chaired by Arnold Webber, chairperson of the New Jersey SACVE, and Wallace Vog, executive secretary of the New York SACVE. Douglas Easterling, executive director of the Maine SACVE, served as recorder.

Mr. Webber started out by briefly reviewing a position paper on the discussion topic prepared by Mr. Vog. The paper offered a series of five questions as a way to focus on the issues involved.

A. What should be the role of the State Councils in encouraging articulation and eliminating duplication? To what extent do we want to, or should we be, involved in this process and how crucial a priority is this for us?

The group readily agreed that the SACVE's should be involved with promoting articulation and encouraging the elimination or avoidance of unnecessary duplication. It was mentioned that the New Jersey SACVE has recently completed a study of duplication in that State, and while serious problems were uncovered, the study also revealed that there are often some very good reasons for duplication. Further discussion pointed out that the total elimination of duplication would produce too many "cracks" in the vocational education delivery system and result in many needs going unmet.

B. Given the independence of each State to develop and operate its schools, can there be a meaningful, nationally-recognized definition for articulation and duplication for vocational education systems?

The question was raised as to why there needs to be such a definition and most participants felt the GAO criticism of vocational education was creating pressure for some determination at the national level as to what are the proper dimensions of articulation and duplication. It is up to the SACVE's to use their own best judgment in looking at articulation and duplication within their own states. Illinois, for instance, has been successful in effecting a regional decision-making process with regard to program offerings.

C. How do we promote and facilitate meaningful coordination and articulation in vocational education?

It was agreed that NACVE could serve as a useful national clearinghouse for disseminating information on these matters. The real issue involved, the group felt, is solving the problems of curriculum development which hinder effective articulation. Creating better articulation between secondary and postsecondary curricula and between curricula and the job markets will involve a great deal of hard, persistent work. Everyone involved will have to be willing to take some risks, accept some failures, and learn through first-hand experience.

D. What should be considered as a "good" duplication vs. "bad"?

The consensus of the group was that this question could best be answered only on an individual basis by each SACVE after careful evaluation of all the considerations involved in each State's own situation.

. Should duplication be defined according to these topics: (1) program vs. administration, (2) population served/target group, (3) geographic limits/jurisdiction, (4) facilities, (5) job availability/market demand, and (6) program certification/competency level?

Participants agreed that all of these factors are useful in defining duplication. It was mentioned that a recent Federal program review in the Rocky Mountain States pointed out significant duplication between vocational education and other government agencies. This type of duplication at the Federal level leads to confusion and problems at the State level. Indeed, NACVE in its own evaluative efforts should consider reviewing the extent to which existing Federal regulations and practices encourage and foster rather than deter problems of duplication and articulation. If the problems prove serious enough, then Congress should cut off funding to duplicative programs and thereby drastically simplify the situation.

Thursday, May 6, 1976

Group 3 - State Plan

Chairperson
Don Brennan, Executive Director, Idaho
Recorder
Linda Phillips, Asst. to Executive Director, California

Topics of Discussion

The small-group discussion centered around the following:

* Relationships between SACVE's and State Boards of Vocational Education
* Potential power ("clout") of SACVE's
* Problems encountered by SACVE's in relation to State Plans
* Ways that SACVE's can impact on State Plans.

In addition, the group made four specific recommendations.

Exchange

Some participants expressed strong concern that the SACVE should be advisory bodies only and should allow Boards to develop the State Plans. SACVE should enter the process in the later stages and should not obstruct the working system that now exists.

> "We can't have councils hanging things up. . .kids have to have programs. . ."

At least one council member stated that little could be done by state councils to influence the planning process.

> "It's a delusion to think (the present system) is changing. . . we're kidding ourselves. . . Boards will get around any objections anyway."

Most participants, however, had a more optimistic view: Enormous changes have taken place. . ." "We've come a long way from just a compliance document." The majority agreed that SACVEs are indeed advisory bodies. However, the councils can have a much greater impact, and they should be closely involved in the entire planning process. Although, by law, SACVE cannot change operations directly, they can be catalysts to encourage others to change.

Most participants agreed that the potential for SACVE was great but that most were not having optimal effect on their Boards. A few even stated that they had little influence. Several SACVE-tested suggestions were offered by the different states:

METHODS USED BY SACVE TO INFLUENCE STATE PLANS

1) Formation of planning committee of SACVE to work specifically on development of the State Plan.

2) Invitations to various groups to submit recommendations and/or criticize Vocational Education with SACVE as liaison to pass comments on to appropriate planners.

3) Meetings with various interest groups (teacher training organizations, post-secondary institutions, State Board, Commissioner, etc.) to determine their desires for State Plan.

4) Public hearings or "Impact Conferences" throughout the state to get ideas of citizens, both educators and non-educators. (Note: Some states have worked closely with local directors of vocational education to plan and conduct these sessions).

5) Use of follow-up studies of vocational education students to provide information on effectiveness of vocational education programs.

6) Meetings of council members with state Vocational Education person(s) responsible for State Plan

7) Provision of time for State Vocational Education personnel on council meeting agendas for input on State Plan

8) Formal and informal contacts between SACVE members and State Board members, e.g. testimony at Board meetings, social affairs.

9) Meeting with Joint Finance and Appropriations Committee of legislature to discuss funding needs of plan.

10) Refusal to "sign off" on State Plan until changes are incorporated.

The group made four recommendations to SACVE and NACVE regarding the State Plan:

(1) SACVE members should work more with State Board members. The groups should have at least one joint meeting a year to exchange ideas and recommendations. Staffs, of course, should continue to work together.

(2) NACVE should provide more assistance to SACVE including information on what other SACVEs are doing, advice on the State Plan process, etc.

(3) NACVE should give SACVE an answer on whether State Plans are to be compliance documents or true plans. In short, a legal decision should be made on whether SACVE can refuse to approve State Plans and thus block flow of federal funds to the states.

(4) SACVE should urge that states conduct needs assessments before doing any planning and allotment of funds.

* * * * *

State Plan--Group Three, May 7, 1976

Mr. Ivan Murray, Chairman of the Arizona Advisory Council, conducted the discussion. He introduced Mr. Gene Dorr, Director of the Division of Vocational Education for Arizona. Mr. Dorr began the outline of Arizona's procedure for developing the State Plan by acknowledging the assistance given by the Department of Economic Security in providing the manpower projections for the State. These figures are incorporated into Table I and are broken down according to OE codes and the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. The Arizona Division also has obtained data relating to the 400 most needy job areas in the State. This information is distributed to the local school districts in September for use in preparing their individual project requests.

The local districts, working with local advisory committees and school boards, prepare project requests based on the objectives and needs for their area. These projects must be submitted to the Division by January 2. The Division staff spends the month of January sorting, ranking, and clarifying local project requests. From these requests the objectives of vocational education for the year are derived and set forth in the Mini-Plan. This Mini-Plan is distributed and discussed throughout the State at meetings with local people, area administrators, and the Advisory Council.

After all the needs are assessed against the objectives, the State Plan is put into rough form and a major hearing is held with the State Board in March. Differences are discussed, more drafting takes place, and the final hearing on the Plan is held in May at which time the various agencies having input to the Plan submit their certification.

In the discussion that followed Mr. Door's outline of the Arizona State Plan process, many states find the common problem of getting people other than those directly involved in vocational education to attend the meetings and become acquainted with the State Plan. The problems caused by lack of advanced funding were also common to all in attendance.

Five questions were posed to the group by Mr. Murray:

1. "Have SACVEs seen any improvements in the planning process and development of the State Plan?" The concensus was that planning and development of the Plan had improved. Continued effort was needed to gain input from citizens and to make them aware that it is "their" State Plan.

2. "Is there a need for clarification of SACVEs role in the certification of the State Plan? If so, who does the State Advisory Council turn to for clarification on the role of certification of the State Plan?" The questions of certification seemed to be minimized where the SACVE felt it had significant input to the Plan. Not all of the SACVE's recommendations might be adopted, but the SACVE would be heard. If there would be a major conflict, most agreed that the State Board would be the deciding body.

3. "Resolve the issue: Is it a State Plan that the States tell the feds, this is what we are going to do in vocational education? or Is it a State Plan whereby the local districts are telling the State what they are going to do in short-range and long-range planning?" Most agreed that Part I was a document telling the feds, this is what we are going to do but that the rest of the plan was based on the local district's requests for short- and long-range planning.

4. "What involvement does the State Advisory Council have? Who sets the State Priorities? Who establishes the State goals? How does the Council's input (hands-on experience) work in your state?" The SACVE gives input to the State Division on priorities and goals and also makes recommendations in its evaluation report that are to be addressed in the next year's State Plan development.

5. "How does input and feedback for the State Plan and Policies come from the general public?" The general public is invited to attend all public hearings during the developmental stages of the Plan. The main problem is in getting the material contained in the Plan to the public in a form they can use and digest.

Respectfully submitted,

Myla Kampshoff, South Dakota
Recorder

PARTICIPANT LIST

PARTICIPANT LIST

John A. Abbruzzese, Jr.
Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania

Edward G. Ackal
99 Beth Drive
Lafayette, Louisiana 70501

Doris Adams
Georgia

Norman Albright
800 Block 2nd Avenue, SE
Decatur, Alabama 35601

Nicholas L. Altieri
Cranbury Neck Road
Cranbury, New Jersey 08512

Phyllis Amick
7319 W. Cedar Circle
Teller Square
Denver, Colorado 80226

Glenn M. Andrews
15 Ross Circle
Auburn, Alabama 36830

Janet Sue Auten
Route 5, Box 161
Boone, North Carolina 28607

Ayo
Louisiana

Louis Bachman, Sr. (Mrs.)
Dover, Delaware

R.A. Baker
Route 1, Box 50
Auburn, Alabama 36830

William A. Ball
Montana

Carlo Barberi
Michigan

Brenda Barr
5025 Hillsboro, Apt. 24-L
Nashville, Tennessee 37215

Rufus W. Beamer
1404 Palmer Drive
Blacksburg, Virginia 24060

Nora Bennett
Dover, Delaware

C. Ed Brandon, Jr.
119 Perryman Road
Louisville, Kentucky 40207

Jimmie D. Brantley
Route 4, Box 584
Newburgh, Indiana 47630

Don Brennan
8495 Midland Drive
Boise, Idaho 83704

Elbert Brooks
911 Otter Creek Road
Nashville, Tennessee 37220

Billy L. Bruns
1243 Hobson Drive
Ferguson, Missouri 63135

John J. Callahan
Charleston, West Virginia

Don Cargill
Atlanta, Georgia

William F. Carroll
Regency East
One Jackson Walkway
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Paula Carter
Indianapolis, Indiana

Bert Caruthers
3235 No. 37th Street
Kansas City, Kansas 66104

Robert C. Cawrse
421 East Main Street
Marblehead, Ohio 43440

James T. Castleberry
Neosho Public Schools
Neosho, Missouri 64850

June M. Clark
New Jersey

Robert W. Cook
Salisbury, Maryland

Dennis Coplen
Washington

Jose I. Correa
Flamboyan 2002, Monteflores
Santurce, Puerto Rico 00915

Joe Coupland
2015 7th Avenue North
Bringham, Alabama 35203

Joan Craig
Georgia Dept. of Education
Atlanta, Georgia

E.A. Crouchley (Ted)
100 South 19th Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68102

Richard Cutbirth
1204 Orange Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada

A.L. Davis, Jr
Louisiana

Anonlita Dickens
903 Couch Street
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501

Joseph J. Dixon
Chicago, Illinois

Winston Dolve
720 - 12th Street
Fargo, North Dakota 58102

Peter T. Doran
77 Rainbow Trail
Denville, New Jersey 07834

Jean Dye
2466 Stratford Road
Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118

Douglas N. Easterling
12 Abbott Street
Waterville, Maine 04901

Bill Elkins
2608 Inwood Road
Dallas, Texas 75235

Austin B. Ezzell
Columbus, Ohio

John J. Farah
1591 Biemeret Street
Green Bay, Wisconsin 54304

Douglas Fellows
Hartford, Connecticut

Wallace Fletcher
Hartford, Connecticut

Gordon Flory
Louisiana

Beatrice Forrest
100 East Bellevue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Lawrence Foth
3501 SW Hodges Road
Topeka, Kansas 66614

Donald L. Fruehling
1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020

Raymond N. Fulton
606 Thistleton Terrace
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

S. Norwood Gasque
809 SCN Center
Main at Lady Streets
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Rudolph J. Girandola
Trenton, New Jersey

Pelton Goudey
Montpelier, Vermont

Donald J. Grabowski
18 Reddy Lane
Loudonville, New York 12211

Russell H. Graham
Coffeyville Comm. Jr. College
Coffeyville, Kansas 67337

George G. Greenleaf
5625 North High Street
Worthington, Ohio 43085

Ted Greer
Washington, D.C.

Rod Hale
Bloomington, Minnesota

William M. Harrison
804 Belaire Drive
Smyrna, Tennessee 37167

Lanny Hassell
Arkansas

John Hawkins
Atlanta, Georgia

Bob Hawks
P.O. Box 7795
South Lake Tahoe, California
95731

J.K. Haynes
Louisiana

Leonard Hergenreter
Executive Director
Denver, Colorado

Roger Hess
4702 North 24th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85016

Jack Higbee
1611 East Deauville Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah 84122

Fred A. Hoke
Executive Director
West Virginia

Dorcas Holicea
Arkansas

Pete Homer, Sr.
Box 787
Parker, Arizona 85344

James Horton
607 - 14th Avenue, North
Wahpeton, North Dakota 58075

Elaine W. House
86 Farms Road Circle
East Brunswick, New Jersey 08816

Billy R. Howard
302 Lyons Drive
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Bruce Howell
1904 Sherwood Drive
Tallahassee, Florida 32303

Caroline Hughes
1000 South Howerton
Cushing, Oklahoma 74023

Alton D. Ice
2304 Berwyn Lane
Austin, Texas 78745

Thomas A. Jackson
12 Argonne Street
Great Falls, South Carolina 29055

Bud Jacobson
Salt Lake City, Utah

Sydney M. Jaffe
2nd and Chestnut Streets
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Harold I. James
Tuscaloosa, Alabama

Tommie Johnson
Michigan

Charles I. Jones
88 Belmont Drive
Huntington, West Virginia 25705

George A. Joplin, III
515 Harvey's Hill
Somerset, Kentucky 42501

Myla Kampshoff
South Dakota

Mary C. Kasten
1209 Sailer Circle
Cape Girardeau, Missouri 63701

Milton Kimpson
2233 Mance Street
Columbis, South Carolina 29203

Larry Kitto
Bloomington, Minnesota

Gordon R. Kutscher
1815 Swift's Highway
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

John J. Lancaster, Jr.
15209 Main Street
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20870

E. Michael Latta
1536 Shadowood Lane
Raleigh, North Carolina 27612

Delbert E. Lewis
1804 North K Street
Elwood, Indiana 46036

Daniel H. Lopez
2726 Campbell Road, NW
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87104

Malcolm R. Lovell, Jr.
3122 P Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007

Duane R. Lund
Crow Wing Heights
Staples, Minnesota 56479

Diana L. Lunsford
West Virginia

Joseph H. Lutz
Montana

Irwin A. MacKay
7319 W. Cedar Circle
Teller Square
Denver, Colorado 80226

Vernon A. Magnesen
953 Fairfield
Elmhurst, Illinois 60126

Judy Ann Marohl
ND State School of Science
Box 1349
Wahpeton, North Dakota 58075

Eugene V. Martin
Washington, D.C.

H.C. Mathis
1450 H.C. Mathis Drive
Paducah, Kentucky 42001

James D. McCartney
1313 Parkview Drive (old)
Margantown, West Virginia 26505

Roy McDermitt
Michigan

Donald N. McDowell
3814 Meyer Avenue
Madison, Wisconsin 53711

James R. McDowell
Louisiana

George B. McGorman
Dover, Delaware

Warren Means
3315 South Airport Road
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501

Robert P. Millslagle
550 Water Street
Santa Cruz, California 95060

Donald C. Mitchell
2608 S. Clenwood
Springfield, Illinois 62704

Michael B. Moon
P.O. Box 44064
Baton Rough, Louisiana 70804

C. Morrison
1003 Sunset Drive
Wabash, Indiana 46992

Andrew J. Moynihan
12 Butler Street
Laconia, New Hampshire 03246

Ivan E. Murray
1701 E. Palmaire
Phoenix, Arizona 85020

William E. Nagel
Carbondale, Illinois

Jim Nash
Bloomington, Minnesota

Odell Newburn
110 North Carlisle
South Bend, Indiana 46619

James O'Hara
Bluefield State College
Bluefield, West Virginia

Franklin Ollivierre
Boston, Massachusetts

Lois Olsen
Michigan

George S. Orr, Jr.
1404 Palmer Drive
Blacksburg, Virginia

Richard C. Owens
Atlanta, Georgia

Raymond C. Parrott
Boston, Massachusetts

Glenita E. Pensoneau
Illinois

J.O. Perpener
Washington, D.C.

Reginald E. Petty
Washington, D.C.

Richard Pfeiffer
74 West Perry Street
Tiffin, Ohio 44883

Linda Phillips
708 10th Street Suite 260
Sacramento, California 95814

David Pinkham
Montpelier, Vermont

James K. Polk
316 Gene Avenue
Charlotte, North Carolina 28205

Robert Pratt
Hartford, Connecticut

Jean B. Purvis
Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania

Luz M.A. Ramos (Mrs.)
San Juan, Puerto Rico

Eugene P. Ranningan
3616--22nd Street, NW
Canton, Ohio 44708

Phyllis E. Reed
Route 1, Box 165
Mt. Savage, Maryland 21545

Robert M. Reese
298 South Street
Worthington, Ohio 43085

Jack B. Reihl
Wisconsin State AFL-CIO
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Elizabeth Rich
172 Clay Street
Milltown, New Jersey 08850

Dorothy R. Robinson
P.O. Box 1212
Palestine, Texas 75801

Charles A. Rosen
Neward, New Jersey

Woodbury Rouse, Sr.
Montpelier, Vermont

William R. Rude
Michigan

Robert Rudiger
Route 3
Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751

Alfred N. Saviguano
498 Court Street
Auburn, Maine 04210

Margaret B. Senne
Route 2, Box 237
Melbourne, Florida 32901

John J. Shannon
Columbus, Ohio

Arthur C. Shropshire
24 Graeler Drive
Creve Coeur, Missouri 63141

Adeline Solomon
Hartford, Connecticut

Dale E. Staley
R.R. 3, Box 3003, No. 103
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Robert A. Stalls
202 East Oak
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Hubert Strayhorn
40 East Chestnut Street
Bordentown, New Jersey 08505

Helen G. Stuart
P.O. Box 85
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

W.R. Sullins
Blacksburg, Virginia

Kenneth L. Svee
4334 Travis Terrace
Madison, Wisconsin 53711

Christine Szigeti (Johnson)
207 Highland Avenue
Gardiner, Maine 04345

Joe G. Taylor
124 Hillcrest
Brownsville, Tennessee

Bob Thwing
Anchorage, Alaska 99801

Margo L. Thornley
15314 Beach Drive, NE
Seattle, Washington 97155

Paul G. Tschetter
2494 South Cook Street
Denver, Colorado 80210

Harry Vandergriff
Arkansas

Gonzalo A. Velez
South Neward, New Jersey

Virginia Vieregg
1016 West Division
Grand Island, Nebraska 68801

F.R. Vihel
100 Encanto Drive
Tempe, Arizona 85281

Wallace Vog
Albany, New York

Richard Waggoner
Dakota Research Associates
208 East 29th
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57105

Arnold K. Weber
Camdem, New Jersey

Carolyn P. Webster (Parker)
Washington, D.C.

Lynda Weissman
1953 Timothy Drive, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30329

Joe R. White
R.F.D. 3
Iowa Falls, Iowa 50126

Robert H. White
1147 Pinecroft Drive
West Columbia, South Carolina

F.R. Winters (Mrs.)
5105 S.W. 18th Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50315

Daniel H. Woods
Arkansas

Burton Wolfman
Boston, Massachusetts

Jerauld B. Wright
1130 Nottingham Circle
Cary, North Carolina 27511

Hewitt Youtz
Laramie, Wyoming

James Zancanella
Laramie, Wyoming

Ralph Bregman

Gail Carleton

Mabel Cason

Dean V. Dannewitz

Jan Kary

Ray Solem

Virginia Solt

W. Dean Starr

Ruth Tangman

George Wallrodt